MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1956

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
JUL

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATIONS

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, *Chairman*

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York

PAUL M. WILSON, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

Department of the Navy

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1956

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATIONS

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, *Chairman*

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York

PAUL M. WILSON, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

Department of the Navy

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
64997 WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico
PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia
CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
DON MAGNUSON, Washington
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
JAMES C. MURRAY, Illinois

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington
GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania
JOHN PHILLIPS, California
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York
CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio
EARL WILSON, Indiana
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan
EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland
CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois
T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio

GEORGE Y. HARVEY, *Staff Director*
KENNETH SPRANKLE, *Assistant Staff Director*

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1955.

WITNESSES

HON. RAYMOND H. FOGLER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MATERIAL)

REAR ADM. SHERMAN R. CLARK, DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION AND SENIOR MEMBER, SHORE STATION DEVELOPMENT BOARD, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

CAPT. EUGENE B. McKINNEY, DIRECTOR OF STAFF, SHORE STATION DEVELOPMENT BOARD, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

REAR ADM. JOHN R. PERRY, CEC, USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

CAPT. CLIFTON B. McFARLAND, CEC, USN, STAFF, SHORE STATION DEVELOPMENT BOARD, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

THOMAS J. SMYTH, STAFF, SHORE STATION DEVELOPMENT BOARD, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

CAPT. JOSEPH A. McHENRY, DEPUTY AND ASSISTANT CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

DONALD M. PATTERSON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO ASSISTANT CHIEF FOR CONSTRUCTION AND REAL ESTATE, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

WILFRED P. TIENCKEN, MANAGER, PLANNING AND REQUIREMENTS BRANCH, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

REAR ADM. HAROLD P. SMITH, USN, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND REPORTS, OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER

R. I. PALMER, MANAGEMENT ENGINEER, NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

JOHN R. DALLERUP, CONSULTANT ON FACILITIES TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MATERIAL)

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

REAR ADM. ROBERT E. CRONIN, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF FIELD ACTIVITIES, BUREAU OF SHIPS

CAPT. FRANK SPRINGER, USN, HEAD, NAVAL FACILITIES BRANCH, BUREAU OF SHIPS

FLEET FACILITIES

REAR ADM. SHERMAN R. CLARK, USN, DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION AND SENIOR MEMBER, SHORE STATION DEVELOPMENT BOARD, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

CAPT. LOUIS LEFELAR, USN, HEAD, OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT SECTION, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

COMDR. KENNETH W. HINES, USN, HEAD, CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT SECTION, LOGISTICS PLANS DIVISION, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

AVIATION FACILITIES

REAR ADM. JAMES S. RUSSELL, USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

CAPT. JOHN W. DAVISON, USN, DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS DIVISION, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

MAJ. DONALD L. FENTON, USMC, MARINE CORPS AIR STATION SECTION, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

MARK R. HANABURY, HEAD, PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION BRANCH, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

CAPT. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, USN, HEAD SHORE ESTABLISHMENT PROGRAMS BRANCH, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SUPPLY FACILITIES

REAR ADM. JOEL D. PARKS, SC, USN, DEPUTY CHIEF, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

COMDR. THEODORE S. STERN, SC, USN, DIRECTOR, STORAGE DIVISION, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

MR. ROBERT E. PESSAUD, HEAD, SHORE FACILITIES BRANCH, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

BRIG. GEN. CHESTER R. ALLEN, USMC, ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE MARINE CORPS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

LT. COL. ELIOTT B. ROBERTSON, USMC, HEAD, OPERATIONS BRANCH, SUPPLY DEPARTMENT, HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

REAR ADM. F. S. WITHINGTON, USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

REAR ADM. PAUL D. STROOP, USN, DEPUTY CHIEF, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

CAPT. GEORGE H. LAIRD, USN, HEAD FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT BRANCH, ORDNANCE ESTABLISHMENTS DIVISION, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

VICE ADM. JAMES L. HOLLOWAY, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

CAPT. EUGENE C. RIDER, USN, DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DIVISION, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

MEDICAL FACILITIES

REAR ADM. BART W. HOGAN, MC, USN, DEPUTY CHIEF, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

CAPT. JAMES B. BULTER, MC, USN, DIRECTOR, PLANNING DIVISION, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

REAR ADM. HENRY C. BRUTON, USN, DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

CAPT. LAWRENCE E. RUFF, USN, HEAD, OPERATIONS BRANCH, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

PUBLIC WORKS, NAVY

Amounts available for obligation

Description	1954 actual	1955 estimate	1956 estimate
Appropriation or estimate		$98,000,000	[1] $530,345,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	$481,297,551	276,122,265	122,405,265
Reimbursements from other accounts		1,283,000	
Total available for obligation	481,297,551	375,405,265	652,750,265
Unobligated balance carried forward	−276,122,265	−122,405,265	−242,750,265
Obligations incurred	205,175,286	253,000,000	410,000,000
Comparative transfer to "Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces"	−8,215,390	−4,252,398	
Total obligations	196,959,896	248,747,602	410,000,000

[1] CLERK'S NOTE.—Actual budget estimate, as finally submitted in H. Doc. 210, July 1, 1955, is in the amount of $528,550,000.

Obligations by activities

Description	1954 actual	1955 estimate	1956 estimate
DIRECT OBLIGATIONS			
1. Zone of Interior	$144,040,806	$170,996,707	$254,000,000
2. Overseas	52,919,090	76,467,895	156,000,000
Total direct obligations	196,959,896	247,464,602	410,000,000
OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE OUT OF REIMBURSEMENTS FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS			
1. Zone of Interior		1,283,000	
Total obligations	196,959,896	248,747,602	410,000,000

Obligations by objects

Object classification	1954 actual	1955 estimate	1956 estimate
SUMMARY			
Total number of permanent positions	3,202	2,785	2,782
Average number of all employees	2,684	2,512	2,495
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary	$4,688	$4,710	$4,681
Average grade	GS–7.0	GS–7.0	GS–7.0
Ungraded positions: Average salary	$2,994	$2,995	$2,995
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$11,143,438	$10,694,259	$10,674,257
Regular pay in excess of 52-week base	36,444	34,928	34,728
Payment above basic rates	972,118	965,267	950,000
Total personal services	12,152,000	11,694,454	11,658,985
02 Travel	630,204	818,900	700,000
03 Transportation of things	1,098,826	1,436,800	1,300,000
04 Communication services	47,556	40,600	40,000
05 Rents and utility services	24,300	31,850	25,000
06 Printing and reproduction	26,495	39,500	35,000
07 Other contractual services	1,103,536	1,353,448	1,200,000
08 Supplies and materials	11,048,690	14,444,000	11,000,000
09 Equipment	5,911,200	7,820,816	7,000,000
10 Lands and structures	164,874,489	211,011,534	376,987,015
15 Taxes and assessments	42,600	55,700	54,000
Total obligations	196,959,896	248,747,602	410,000,000

General Statements on Overall Construction Program

Mr. Sheppard. The committee is convening today to consider the Public Works appropriation request for 1956. We have before us a series of Navy's official family. We had a general statement from Secretary Fogler and others before the full committee and I presume there is no necessity for repetition in that regard.

Admiral Smith, are you prepared to present your statement covering the requests we have before us for consideration?

Admiral Smith. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sheppard. You will make your presentation and we will not interrupt you until you have completed it.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL SMITH

Admiral Smith. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when the President submitted his budget for fiscal year 1956 to the Congress last January he indicated several items proposed for later transmission, including military public works. As a part of that program the Navy is presenting for your consideration a fiscal year 1956 "Public works, Navy" appropriation request totaling $530,345,000. It is made up of the following:

To fund fiscal year 1956 authorizations:	
Family housing	$56, 185, 300
Other public works	426, 854, 000
Subtotal	483, 039, 300
To fund previous authorizations:	
Family housing	13, 264, 700
Other public works	34, 041, 000
Subtotal	47, 305, 700
Total fiscal year 1956 appropriation request	530, 345, 000

To briefly review this continuing appropriation: The Navy received authorization for new requirements totaling $91 million in fiscal year 1954. No new funds were appropriated but the Congress provided authority whereby construction funds appropriated in previous years were made available for any public works projects for which authorization was cited. In fiscal year 1955 this authority was continued when only $98 million was appropriated against a new authorization of $202 million. This congressional funding authority has been very helpful in that it has provided the means by which our most important programs could be accomplished. A similar provision is contained in the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation request to permit us to continue with the most urgent construction in support of current Navy operating requirements.

At the present time the remaining unobligated balance of this appropriation is almost completely committed for authorized work and we are seeking only those funds necessary in fiscal year 1956 for current requirements approved by the Department of Defense. The $530,345,000 requested is the amount necessary in fiscal year 1956 to support the Navy's planned construction program.

Rear Admiral Perry, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks has a statement covering the status of the appropriation. He will be

followed by Rear Admiral Clark, senior member of the Shore Station Development Board, who has a statement regarding our public works requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Unless there is objection on the part of the committee, we will have the statements in toto and then we will inquire into them after they are presented.

The next one is Admiral Perry, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Do you have a statement, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed, please.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL PERRY

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear again before this committee in support of the "Public works, Navy" program and to present to you our plans for carrying out this program.

As you are aware, this is a continuing appropriation. Accordingly, a brief review of our past performance would appear to be in order. Since fiscal year 1948, we have received in appropriations a total of $1.904 billion. By June 30 of this year, we will have obligated all but $122 million, and will have unpaid balances for active work in progress amounting to an additional $205 million, or a total of $327 million unexpended. The $122 million in unobligated funds is the lowest carryover balance we have been faced with in recent years, and compares with balances of $515 million available at the end of fiscal year 1952, $475 million for 1953, and $272 million for 1954. This year's projected balance consists of $65 million in real construction dollars, while the remainder of $57 million represents reserves for such essential purposes as advance planning, contract administration and inspection, collateral equipment, contingencies, and similar purposes.

Our current program, from the engineering standpoint, has been developed according to sound engineering and economic principles. The design and cost data contained in the budget request now before you has been prepared through extensive use of the advance planning authority and funds granted to us by the Congress for this purpose, and has been carefully reviewed, brick by brick so to speak, at each step in the budget process. We have used these funds, and propose to continue their use, to the end that we consistently develop strictly functional facilities with a degree of durability which is fully compatible with their missions. In addition to utilizing advance planning funds for the preparation of budget estimates, we also propose to utilize some of these funds for the preparation of working drawings and specifications.

With respect to our ability to place this new work under contract, I am confident that our organization is equal to the assignment, as we have expended considerable effort during the past year toward cleaning up, both physically and financially, our prior years' programs. I therefore feel certain that we are ready to undertake this new program with vigor and, as one more beneficial result of advance planning, with much better advance information on our program than in earlier years. Adding our $122 million carryover to the $530 million request now pending will give us a total of $652 million available for the coming year. We estimate that we can place $410

million of this amount under contract by July 1, 1956, leaving $242 million unobligated at the end of the fiscal year. Here again, only $160 million of this balance will consist of real construction dollars. The remaining $82 million must be earmarked for our essential reserves for the purposes other than construction, which were outlined earlier.

I will be present throughout these hearings and I will be pleased to answer any questions concerning the operation of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the Navy's public works program which the committee may have in mind.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you.

Now, Admiral Clark, do you have a statement you wish to present at this time?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may proceed with your statement.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL CLARK

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to present for your consideration the Navy Department's request for authority to fund the public works projects which have been authorized but not yet approved for funding.

Before presenting the projects in detail I should like first to outline the broad objectives of the Navy's program, the progress we have made in the recent past, the outlook for the next few years, and finally describe briefly how the program is formulated.

As in years past our public works program is based on a continuing shore station improvement plan designed to support the current and planned force levels of the Navy. The facilities included are essential to meet our strategic requirements, to keep abreast of technological advancements in materials and weapons, to replace deteriorated and uneconomical facilities, to conduct research to meet the fleet's operational needs, and to improve living conditions for our personnel.

Our progress in the recent past and our rate of progress today in providing the essential facilities required are shown on the chart.

The red bars show total urgent requirements submitted to the Navy Department by the Shore Establishment. In 1954 our requirements totaled $1.3 billion. We received $87 million in authorization but no new funds. In fiscal year 1955 our requirements were $1.2 billion. We received authorizations totaling $202 million. Our funding request was $140 million against which $98 million was appropriated. This year the urgent requirements totaling $1.2 billion. By applying the most austere criteria we are requesting funding authority for only the most pressingly urgent items.

But we have reached a turning point. The requests for next year, the fiscal year 1957 Public Works projects, have recently reached the Navy Department. The urgent lists total $1.5 billion; but the total foreseeable requirements which were submitted as the necessary projects to bring the Shore Establishment into a really satisfactory state of readiness in light of planned improvements and needed replacements is $3.8 billion as shown by the hatched and solid bar on the right of the chart. There are several reasons why we have reached a turning point. In the past few years, we have been eating up our working capital so that we must have a sizable increase in new appro-

priations to even hold our own. Then, that red bar on the right, the 1957 urgent requirement, is even more solid than those preceding it, being made up of a high percentage of such vital requirements as new bases for our airborne early warning system. And our replacement needs also are reaching a critical point. Whereas we have been "making do" with many deteriorated structures by constant patching and propping up, this deterioration is becoming progressively worse to the point where many structures are now actually failing and, to prevent injury or loss of life, must either be replaced or extensively rebuilt.

It is a conservative estimate, therefore, that if we get all the funds we are asking for this year, our next year's request will be no smaller. And if we are to make substantial progress in replacing uneconomical facilities, our request should be even larger.

In conclusion I should like to describe briefly, how the Navy's public works program has been formulated.

Each activity in the Shore Establishment has a master plan. This has been developed from the guidance furnished by the basic Naval Establishment plan, mobilization plans, and other planning directives furnished by the Navy Department. From the master plan lists of projects are developed, divided into categories as follows:

First, those construction items that are so urgently required that authorization and funds must be obtained this fiscal year in order that the station may carry out its immediate tasks. The program before you contains only projects in this category. The second group of projects is called essential and comprises projects which should be undertaken not later than the following fiscal year. The third class is termed "important" and consists of all items which should be constructed no later than 2 years hence, and finally all other projects needed to place the activity in complete readiness for mobilization are listed in the long-range portion of the program. The sum of the essential, important, and long-range items at present is as indicated by the hatched portion of the right-hand bar on the chart. These station programs are reviewed by the district commandants to insure that there are no unnecessary duplications and also that provision has been made for carrying out all the required functions by the various activities in the commandant's jurisdiction. The projects are then again reviewed by the management bureaus and offices of the Navy Department which, in turn, submit their programs to the Shore Station Development Board in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. This Board carefully reviews every project to insure that none except thoroughly justified items are included and that the program as a whole supports the program objectives of the Navy Department. The program is further revieweed by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget before it is presented to Congress.

Though the reviews which I mentioned above are annual affairs, I wish to emphasize that the Navy's Shore Station Improvement Plan is a continuing one which is actually under constant review and modification. We are convinced that every project now before you is urgently required in the interest of National Defense and earnestly request your favorable consideration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that complete the general statements you want to present at this time?

Admiral CLARK. At this time; yes, sir.

CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY UNDER H. R. 6829

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to have the record show at one place information that I am desirous of having before me, I would like to have you state at this time the total amount of authority that is invested in H. R. 6829.

Admiral CLARK. That is $596,140,900. And that includes housing.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral, I would like to have you supply for the record at this point your authority that is invested in H. R. 6829, that is, your construction authority and your authority heretofore that has been unfunded, in total. If you will being those two figures together for a total answer, I will appreciate it.

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, the total amount of authority in H. R. 6829 is $596,140,900 as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services. We have $287 million previously authorized which is still unfunded. That latter figure may be broken down into $151,400,000 which we are asking to rescind, and $135,600,000 which is still remaining unfunded authorization.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the total amount was what?

Admiral CLARK. The total amount was $883,140,900.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The complete authority you have under present legislation and unfunded is how much in total?

Admiral CLARK. $731,740,900.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total new money you are requesting in the budget presently before the committee?

Admiral CLARK. We are requesting funding authority for a total of $646,196,300. We are asking for funds in the amount of $530,345,000 to fund that total funding authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much unexpended balance will you have on June 30, 1955?

Admiral PERRY. $122 million unobligated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is unexpended and unobligated?

Admiral PERRY. No; that is only unobligated. The total amount we will have unexpended, which you must understand is only estimated, because we do not know how fast the vouchers will come in, but will be $327 million at the end of the year. The unobligated balance is only $122 million. In other words, we have partially completed contracts outstanding which are obligations, but the money has not been taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen; I think that clarifies what I have in mind on that.

(Discussion off the record.)

SUMMARY OF 1956 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUNDING PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will insert in the record the summary on the first two sheets of volumne 1.

(The matter above referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Summary, fiscal year 1956 authorization request

Class of facility	Continental	Overseas	Total
Shipyard facilities	$51,397,600	$57,000	$51,454,600
Fleet base facilities	18,427,000	26,170,500	44,597,500
Aviation facilities	179,367,600	134,789,600	314,157,200
Naval Air training stations	(44,410,500)		
Fleet support air stations	(44,440,200)		
Marine Corps air stations	(16,614,900)		
Special purpose air stations	(73,902,000)		
Supply facilities	1,895,200	7,358,900	9,254,100
Marine Corps facilities	16,573,300	45,064,000	61,637,300
Ordnance facilities	15,444,000	6,018,900	21,462,900
Service school facilities	30,074,800	44,000	30,118,800
Medical facilities	2,572,700	269,000	2,841,700
Communication facilities	436,000	25,675,800	26,111,800
Office of Naval Research facilities	215,000	0	215,000
Yards and Docks facilities	[1] 30,281,000	4,009,000	34,290,000
Total	346,684,200	249,456,700	596,140,900
Sec. 201 (unclassified projects)	331,607,200	107,191,300	438,798,500
Sec. 202 (classified projects)	9,077,000	142,265,400	151,342,400
Sec. 203 (corr. of defs.)	[1] 6,000,000	(1)	6,000,000
Total	346,684,200	249,456,700	596,140,900

[1] Continental and overseas.

Summary, fiscal year 1956 funding program

Class of facility	Continental	Overseas	Total
Shipyard facilities	$51,718,900	$57,000	$51,775,900
Fleet base facilities	19,471,500	29,296,500	48,768,000
Aviation facilities	188,268,900	140,569,600	328,838,500
Naval Air training stations	(46,080,100)		
Fleet Support air stations	(47,712,300)		
Marine Corps air stations	(20,490,500)		
Special purpose air stations	(73,986,000)		
Supply facilities	1,895,200	7,358,900	9,254,100
Marine Corps facilities	24,542,300	45,064,000	69,606,300
Ordnance facilities	15,444,000	6,268,900	21,712,900
Service school facilities	32,048,800	44,000	32,092,800
Medical facilities	2,572,700	269,000	2,841,700
Communication facilities	436,000	27,946,800	28,382,800
Office of Naval Research facilities	215,000	0	215,000
Yards and Docks facilities	46,499,300	6,209,000	52,708,300
Total	383,112,600	263,083,700	646,196,300
Classified projects included in above	(9,077,000)	(147,816,400)	(156,893,400)
Adjustment (including $69,477,000 for family housing)			530,372,000

BREAKDOWN OF PROJECTS BY LOCATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, gentlemen, I would like to ask you for a straight listing of projects for which you are requesting funding approval totaling $646,196,300, by location. Do you have that detail?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir, we have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you insert that in the record at this point?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next I would like to have your priority funding list. Do you have a list showing how you would spread the $530,345,000 being requested for appropriation purposes?

Admiral CLARK. I have that here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right; insert that in the record.

(The statements are as follows:)

Public works construction program, fiscal year 1956

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(1)	Authorization requested, fiscal year 1956 (2)	Funding program, fiscal year 1956 (3)	Tentative supplementary funding list [1] (4)
Shipyard facilities:			
Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass	$8,441,000	$8,441,000	$3,006,000
Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash	200,000	200,000	
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md	14,302,000	14,302,000	
Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Charleston, S. C	427,000	427,000	
Naval minecraft base, Charleston, S. C	5,800,000	5,800,000	
Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif	4,553,000	4,553,000	1,825,000
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va	308,000	308,000	
Naval underwater sound laboratory, New London, Conn	66,600	66,600	
Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla	3,379,000	3,379,000	372,000
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa	[2]	321,300	
Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H	946,000	946,000	791,000
Naval Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, Calif	143,000	143,000	
Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Calif	629,000	629,000	
Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif	4,369,000	4,369,000	
Total shipyard facilities, continental	43,563,600	43,884,900	5,994,000
Fleet base facilities:			
Naval station, Green Cove Springs, Fla	72,000	72,000	
Naval station, Key West, Fla	[2]	1,044,500	
Naval station, Newport, R. I	1,583,000	1,583,000	
Naval base, Norfolk, Va	9,972,000	9,972,000	
Naval station, Orange, Tex	399,000	399,000	
Naval station, San Diego, Calif	57,000	57,000	
Naval station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif	3,147,000	3,147,000	3,085,000
Naval station, Tacoma, Wash	3,024,000	3,024,000	
Naval station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg	92,000	92,000	
Navy Department, Washington, D. C	81,000	81,000	
Total fleet base facilities, continental	18,427,000	19,471,500	3,085,000
Aviation facilities:			
Naval air training stations:			
Auxiliary landing field, Alice Orange Grove area, Texas	1,487,000	1,487,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Barin Field, Foley, Ala	151,000	151,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex	1,953,500	1,953,500	
Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex	664,000	664,000	
Naval air station, Glynco, Ga	1,886,000	3,290,600	
Naval air station, Hutchinson, Kans	81,000	81,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex	3,686,000	3,951,000	
Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn	759,000	759,000	576,000
Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla	3,453,000	3,453,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Port Isabel, Tex	5,544,000	5,544,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La	24,361,000	24,361,000	4,974,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Whiting Field, Fla	385,000	385,000	
Total naval air training stations	44,410,500	46,080,100	5,550,000
Fleet support air stations:			
Naval air station, Alameda, Calif	3,729,000	3,729,000	182,000
Naval air station, Atlantic City, N. J	233,000	233,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, Calif	214,600	214,600	
Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine	3,200,000	3,285,000	918,000
Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla	7,400,000	9,099,200	557,000
Auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing, Calif	[3]	89,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif	366,000	591,000	
Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev	1,172,700	1,264,700	
Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla	2,224,000	2,224,000	
Naval air station, Key West, Fla	211,000	484,900	
Naval auxiliary landing field, Mayport, Fla	812,000	812,000	
Naval air station, Miramar, Calif	4,370,000	4,370,000	
Naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif	2,581,000	2,581,000	
Naval air station, Norfolk, Va	5,260,000	5,260,000	750,000
Naval air station, Oceana, Va	5,281,000	5,281,000	
Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I	1,062,000	1,062,000	375,000
Naval air station, San Diego, Calif	2,748,000	3,556,000	296,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla	188,900	188,900	
Naval air facility, Weeksville, N. C	342,000	342,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 14.

Public works construction program, fiscal year 1956—Continued

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

(1)	Authorization requested, fiscal year 1956 (2)	Funding program, fiscal year 1956 (3)	Tentative supplementary funding list [1] (4)
Aviation facilities—Continued			
Fleet support air stations—Continued			
Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Wash.	$1,958,000	$1,958,000	$1,037,000
Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.	1,087,000	1,087,000	
Total fleet support air stations, continental	44,440,200	47,712,300	4,115,000
Marine Corps air stations:			
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.	4,649,000	7,274,600	
Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.	1,762,000	3,012,000	650,000
Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.	2,492,000	2,492,000	
Marine Corps auxiliary landing field, Edenton, N. C.	1,421,500	1,421,500	
Marine Corps air station, Miami, Fla.	1,223,000	1,223,000	
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.	2,305,400	2,305,400	
Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.	2,762,000	2,762,000	
Total Marine Corps air stations, continental	16,614,900	20,490,500	650,000
Special purpose air stations:			
Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis area, Maryland	16,900,000	16,900,000	12,900,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Chincoteague, Va.	2,858,000	2,858,000	
Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern China Lake), Calif.	2,615,000	2,615,000	
Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.	16,311,000	16,311,000	
Naval air test center, Patuxent River, Md.	8,677,000	8,677,000	
Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.	926,000	1,010,000	
Naval air station, South Weymouth, Mass.	270,000	270,000	
Photographic interpretation center, Suitland, Md.	2,345,000	2,345,000	
Various locations	23,000,000	23,000,000	
Special purpose air stations, continental	73,902,000	73,986,000	12,900,00
Total, aviation facilities, continental	179,367,600	188,268,900	23,215,000
Supply facilities:			
Naval fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla.	15,200	15,200	
Naval supply depot, Newport, R. I.	1,041,000	1,041,000	
Naval supply center, Norfolk, Va.	777,000	777,000	
Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.	62,000	62,000	
Total supply facilities, continental	1,895,200	1,895,200	
Marine Corps facilities:			
Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.	3,157,000	4,869,300	
Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.	501,000	501,000	
Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.	1,059,000	1,059,000	
Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C.	1,654,000	1,654,000	
Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.	648,000	648,000	
Marine Corps clothing depot, annex 3, Philadelphia, Pa.	30,000	30,000	4,400,000
Marine Corps School, Quantico, Va.	9,357,000	15,613,700	
Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.	120,000	120,000	
Marine Corps training center, Twentynine Palms, Calif.	47,300	47,300	
Total, Marine Corps facilities, continental	16,573,300	24,542,300	4,400,000
Ordnance facilities:			
Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.	$193,000	$193,000	
Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va.	644,000	644,000	
Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex.	1,111,000	1,111,000	
Naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J.	59,000	59,000	
Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif.	514,000	514,000	
Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev.	1,424,000	1,424,000	
Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md.	1,107,000	1,107,000	
Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern (China Lake), Calif.	375,000	375,000	
Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Wash.	376,000	376,000	
Naval ordnance plant, Louisville, Ky.	927,000	927,000	927,000
Naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga.	3,800,000	3,800,000	
Naval underwater ordnance station, Newport, R. I.	370,000	370,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 14.

Public works construction program, fiscal year 1956—Continued

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

(1)	Authorization requested, fiscal year 1956 (2)	Funding program, fiscal year 1956 (3)	Tentative supplementary funding list [1] (4)
Ordnance facilities—Continued			
Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif	$241,000	$241,000	$241,000
Naval ammunition depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va	420,000	420,000	
Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif	1,029,000	1,029,000	1,029,000
Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Ark	765,000	765,000	
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md	1,976,000	1,976,000	
Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va	113,000	113,000	
Total ordnance facilities, continental	15,444,000	15,444,000	2,197,000
Service school facilities:			
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md	11,467,000	11,467,000	11,285,000
Naval station, Annapolis, Md	307,000	307,000	
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga	[2]	456,000	
Naval receiving station, Charleston, S. C	553,000	553,000	
Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif	1,402,000	1,402,000	
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va	1,942,000	1,942,000	
Naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill	8,038,800	9,556,800	3,992,000
Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md	780,000	780,000	
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, Calif	119,000	119,000	
Naval receiving station, Philadelphia, Pa	1,428,000	1,428,000	
Retraining Command, Portsmouth, N. H	42,000	42,000	
Fleet Sonar School, San Diego, Calif	2,753,000	2,753,000	
Total service school facilities, continental	28,831,800	30,805,800	15,277,000
Medical facilities:			
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md	350,000	350,000	350,000
Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass	192,800	192,800	
Naval hospital, Corona, Calif	256,800	256,800	
Naval hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex	162,100	162,100	
Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill	750,000	750,000	
Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla	46,000	46,000	
Naval submarine base, New London, Conn	755,000	755,000	
Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa	60,000	60,000	
Total medical facilities, continental	2,572,700	2,572,700	350,000
Communication facilities: Naval radio station, Northwest, Va	436,000	436,000	
Office of Naval Research facilities:			
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, Bellevue, District of Columbia	163,000	163,000	
Chesapeake Bay Annex, Naval Research Laboratory, Randle Cliffs, Md	52,000	52,000	
Total, Office of Naval Research facilities, continental	215,000	215,000	
Yards and docks facilities:			
Naval construction battalion center, Davisville, R. I	5,397,000	5,397,000	
Public works center, Norfolk, Va	2,510,000	2,510,000	
Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif	1,225,000	1,225,000	
Various locations, pollution abatement program including land acquisition	15,149,000	15,149,000	15,149,000
Various locations, advance planning	[4]	15,000,000	2,500,000
Various locations, Navy and Marine Corps rehabilitation of existing housing	[2]	1,218,300	
Total yards and docks facilities, continental	24,281,000	40,499,300	17,649,000
Total, continental United States	331,607,200	368,035,600	72,167,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 14.

Public works construction program, fiscal year 1956—Continued

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(1)	Authorization requested, fiscal year 1956 (2)	Funding program, fiscal year 1956 (3)	Tentative supplementary funding list [1] (4)
Shipyard facilities: Fleet activities, Sasebo, Japan	$57,000	$57,000	$57,000
Fleet base facilities:			
Naval station, Adak, Alaska	2,485,000	2,485,000	
Naval base, Guam, Mariana Islands	1,835,000	1,835,000	
Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	56,000	56,000	
Naval base, Subic Bay, P. I	15,253,700	18,379,700	
Fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan	6,540,800	6,540,800	
Fleet base facilities, overseas	26,170,500	29,296,500	
Aviation facilities:			
Naval air station, Agana, Guam	6,525,000	6,525,000	6,525,000
Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland	8,589,800	8,589,800	
Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan	1,978,800	1,978,800	
Naval station, Bermuda, British West Indies	91,000	91,000	
Naval air facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands	8,260,000	8,489,000	
Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	2,977,300	2,977,300	
Naval air facility, Iwakuni, Japan	975,000	975,000	
Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe, T. H	3,227,600	3,227,600	574,000
Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska	2,613,100	2,613,100	
Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands	4,411,000	4,411,000	1,093,000
Naval station, Midway, T. H	1,518,000	1,518,000	365,000
Naples, Italy	155,000	155,000	
Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco	1,958,500	1,958,500	
Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R	3,721,000	3,721,000	
Naval station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands	522,900	522,900	
Total aviation facilities, overseas	47,524,000	47,753,000	8,557,000
Supply facilities:			
Naval supply depot, Guam, Mariana Islands	5,427,000	5,427,000	1,847,000
Naval supply depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	1,318,000	1,318,000	
Naval supply center, Pearl Harbor, T. H	270,000	270,000	172,000
Total supply facilities, overseas	7,015,000	7,015,000	2,019,000
Ordnance facilities:			
Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H	1,132,000	1,382,000	250,000
Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan	66,000	66,000	
Total ordnance facilities, overseas	1,198,000	1,448,000	250,000
Service school facilities: Fleet training center, Pearl Harbor, T. H	44,000	44,000	
Medical facilities: Naval hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands	269,000	269,000	
Communication facilities:			
Naval communications station, Adak, Alaska	439,000	439,000	
Naval radio facility, Kami Seya, Japan	2,564,700	2,564,700	
Naval communications station, Kodiak, Alaska	6,991,000	6,991,000	
Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands	8,061,500	10,332,500	
Naval communication facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco	2,848,600	2,848,600	
Total communications facilities, overseas	20,904,800	23,175,800	
Yards and Docks Facilities:			
15th Naval District, Canal Zone	3,069,000	3,069,000	
Guam, Mariana Islands	940,000	940,000	
Various locations—replacement housing	[2]	2,200,000	
Total yards and docks facilities, overseas	4,009,000	6,209,000	
Total outside continental United States	107,191,300	115,267,300	10,883,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 14.

Public works construction program, fiscal year 1956—Continued

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES (CLASSIFIED)

(1)	Authorization requested, fiscal year 1956 (2)	Funding program, fiscal year 1956 (3)	Tentative supplementary funding list [1] (4)
Shipyard facilities: Various classified locations: Sound search stations including land acquisition	$7,834,000	$7,834,000	
Service school facilities: Location classified, school buildings	1,243,000	1,243,000	
Total classified, continental	9,077,000	9,077,000	

OUTSIDE UNITED STATES (CLASSIFIED)

Aviation facilities: Classified location:			
Naval air facility No. 1, CINCNELM	$1,869,000	$1,869,000	$1,869,000
AEW No. 2	19,099,200	19,099,200	16,520,000
AEW No. 3	39,247,000	39,247,000	8,857,000
NAF No. 3	27,050,400	27,050,400	4,804,000
Additional aviation facilities	(4)	5,551,000	
Total classified aviation facilities outside United States	87,265,600	92,816,600	32,050,000
Supply facilities: Classified location:			
A, family housing	84,100	84,100	
B, family housing	84,100	84,100	
C, family housing	175,700	175,700	
Total classified supply facilities outside continental United States	343,900	343,900	
Marine Corps facilities:			
Classified location, Fleet Marine Force Pacific, camp facilities	45,000,000	45,000,000	
Classified location, Headquarters Fleet Marine Force Pacific, bivouac area	64,000	64,000	
Total classified Marine Corps facilities outside United States	45,064,000	45,064,000	
Ordnance facilities: Classified locations, ammunition storage facilities and family housing	4,820,900	4,820,900	
Communications facilities: Classified location:			
Naval Communication Unit No. 1	771,000	771,000	
Naval Radio Station North Atlantic Area	4,000,000	4,000,000	750,000
Total classified communications facilities outside United States	4,771,000	4,771,000	750,000
Total classified outside United States	142,265,400	147,816,400	32,800,000
Total classified continental	9,077,000	9,077,000	
Grand total classified	151,342,400	156,893,400	32,800,000

CORRECTION OF DEFICIENCIES

Yards and docks facilities: Various locations, continental and overseas, correction of deficiencies	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	
Title II, grand total	596,140,900	646,196,300	$115,851,300

[1] The figures in the 4th column represent the amounts for line items that the Navy tentatively plans to fund if, for any reason, line items in the tentative primary funding list, totaling $530,345,000, cannot be prosecuted within a reasonable time.

[3] Public Law, 763, 83d Cong.

[3] Public Law 534, 83d Cong.

[4] Public Law 155, 82d Cong.

(CLERKS NOTE.—At time of hearings, final action had not been taken on the 1956 authorization bill, H. R. 6829. Neither had a formal budget request for appropriation been received. Final conference action on H. R. 6829 affects the foregoing tabulations, and related tabulations throughout the printed hearings. The final conference action has the following effects:)

	1956 authorization	Funding program requested
Total of above table	$596,140,900	$646,196,300
Deduct items included which are not in final version of H. R. 6829:		
Naval air facility, Annapolis	16,900,000	16,900,000
Naval Academy:		
Bancroft Hall extension	7,500,000	7,500,000
Fill Dewey and Santee Basins	3,785,000	3,785,000
Family housing (335 units):		
NAAS, Whiting Field, Fla	385,000	385,000
NAAS, Fallon, Nev	131,700	131,700
NALF, Mayport, Fla	74,000	74,000
NTC, Great Lakes, Ill	3,700,800	3,700,800
Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex	162,100	162,100
NAS, Norfolk, Va. (reduction in amount for bombing targets, Parramore Island)	600,000	600,000
NSC, Norfolk (Cheatham Annex grade crossing)	378,000	378,000
Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va. (reduction in amount for trunk highway)	500,000	500,000
Total deductions	34,116,600	34,116,600
Add items not included which are in the final version of H. R. 6829:		
Naval shipyard, Puget Sound (plans and specifications for new drydock)	2,000,000	2,000,000
Naval proving ground, Dahlgren, Va., land acquisition	200,000	200,000
Total additions	2,200,000	2,200,000
Revised total	564,224,300	614,279,700

LAND ACQUISITION ITEMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, I would like to have a separate listing of the land acquisition items in this program pending before the committee. Do you have that?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir, we have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right; insert it at this point.

(The matter above referred to is as follows:)

Land acquisition—1956 program

Station	Area acres		Estimated cost including improvements
	Fee	Easement	
NAF, Annapolis, Md	4,700		$3,200,000
NIRS, Charleston, S. C	17.11		427,000
USNMCS, Panama City, Fla	468		270,000
NEL, San Diego, Calif	398		143,000
NSY, San Francisco, Calif	353.26		1,600,000
NAS, Alameda, Calif	54		54,000
ALF, Alice-Orange, Tex	925		539,000
NCAS, Beaufort, S. C	1,820		626,000
MCAS Beaufort, (target)	7,700		52,000
NAS, Brunswick, Maine	200		85,000
MCAS, Cherry Point, N. C	1		1,000
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex	1,731		2,000
NAAS, El Centro, Calif	210		84,000
MCAS, El Toro, Calif. (Plano Tra.)	510		69,000
NAAS, New Iberia, La	4,500		2,915,000
NAS, Jacksonville, Fla. (targets)	10,230	17,250	536,000
NAS, Norfolk, Va. (targets)	7,000		300,000
MCAAS, Mojave, Calif	420		25,000
NAAS, Port Isabel, Tex	1,414		103,000
NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash	1,193		810,000
OLF, Whitehouse Field, Fla	900		50,000
Chase Field, Tex	325		178,000
Kingsville, Tex	328		106,000
Miami, Fla	640		1,223,000
MCSD, Barstow, Calif	1,082		11,000
MCS, Quantico, Va		1.8	19,000
NPG, Dahlgren, Va	850		200,000
Naval Base, Norfolk, Va	250		2,000
NSC, Oakland, Calif		2	2,000
NSC, Pearl Harbor		6.8	60,000
Pearl powerline easement		1	4,000
Nav Mag, Port Chicago, Calif.[1]	4,520		1,688,000
Total	48,039.37	17,261.6	12,184,000
Flight clearance, various locations.[2]	10,840	95,520	23,000,000
Grand total	58,879.37	112,781.6	35,184,000

[1] Deleted by House Armed Services Committee.
[2] 25,230 acres outside approach zone have improvements requiring removal.

Land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance

Location	Fee	Easement	Estimated cost including improvements
ALF, Alice-Orange, Tex	140	1,390	51,400
NAAS, Barin Field, Ala	1,350	2,300	409,000
MCAS, Beaufort, S. C		840	445,000
NAAS, Brown Field, Calif	60	2,260	408,500
NAS, Brunswick, Maine	110	1,280	332,900
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla	400	2,300	680,000
MCAS, Cherry Point, N. C		4,000	20,000
NAAS, Chincoteague, Va	600	640	770,000
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex		1,560	377,100
ALF, Crows Landing, Calif	200	1,620	786,900
MCALF, Edenton, N. C	60	530	757,200
NAAS, El Centro, Calif	220	5,000	625,800
MCAS, El Toro, Calif		5,360	578,800
NAAS, Fallon, Nev	1,450	970	295,100
NALF, Fentress, Va	60	1,060	1,470,000
NAAS, Glynco, Ga	630	1,630	220,000
NAAS, New Iberia, La		2,140	210,500
NAS, Johnsville, Pa		260	116,800
NAS, Key West, Fla	700	150	293,000
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif		2,130	576,000
NALF, Mayport, Fla	600		301,000
NAS, Memphis, Tenn	200		25,000
MCAS, Miami, Fla		1,200	50,000
NAS, Miramar, Calif	30	900	275,000
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif	500		3,750,000
MCAAS, Mojave, Calif		2,300	205,500
NAS, Oceana, Va	100	2,270	2,045,000
NATC, Patuxent, Md	80	200	650,000
NAS, Pensacola, Fla		1,000	419,000
NAMTC, Point Mugu, Calif		1,560	176,000
NAAS, Port Isabel, Tex	280	1,800	61,600
MCAF, Santa Ana, Calif		2,710	171,000
NAAS, Saufley Field, Fla	1,000	2,960	1,269,000
NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash	100	5,560	253,600
OLF, Whitehouse Field, Fla	1,100	2,500	679,000
NAS, Whiting Field, Fla	870	4,550	338,000
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa		200	392,000
NAAS, Chase Field, Tex		3,040	111,500
NAAS, Kingsville, Tex		7,280	268,900
OLFS, Pensacola, Fla		18,070	2,134,900
Total	10,840	95,520	23,000,000

BREAKDOWN OF FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next I would like to have a listing, separately, of family housing in this program presented before the committee. Do you have that available?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right; insert it at this point.

(The matter above referred to is as follows:)

Department of the Navy

Fiscal year 1956 military public works program—Family housing—Revised June 1, 1955

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION REQUIRED

	Units	Amount
OVERSEAS		
Fleet base facilities:		
Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands, 15 senior, 45 junior, 313 enlisted	373	$7,514,700
Naval station, Adak, Alaska, 2 senior, 7 junior, 61 enlisted, 1 civilian	71	2,485,000
Fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan, 3 senior, 79 junior, 326 enlisted	408	6,540,800
Aviation facilities:		
Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland, 24 senior, 69 junior, 207 enlisted	300	7,515,800
Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska, 3 senior, 12 junior, 65 enlisted	80	2,613,100
Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan, 7 senior, 23 junior, 60 enlisted	90	1,514,800
Naval air facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands, 8 senior, 12 junior, 25 enlisted (45 units included in fleet project for naval station, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands).		
Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, T. H., 3 senior, 7 junior, 45 enlisted	55	1,192,600
Classified location, AEW No. 2, 3 senior, 7 junior, 20 enlisted	30	636,200
Classified location, NAF No. 3, 10 senior, 31 junior, 109 enlisted	150	2,074,400
Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, 2 junior, 25 enlisted	27	492,300
Naval station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands, 1 senior, 3 junior, 22 enlisted	26	522,900
NAF and NOF, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 4 senior, 16 junior, 88 enlisted	108	1,891,500
Supply facilities:		
Classified location, naval fuel facility "A", 2 junior, 3 enlisted, 1 civilian	6	84,100
Classified location, naval fuel facility "B", 2 junior, 3 enlisted, 1 civilian	6	84,100
Classified location, naval fuel facility "C", 1 senior, 1 junior, 5 enlisted, 5 civilian	12	175,700
Ordnance facilities:		
Classified location, ammo storage facility "A", 1 senior, 1 junior, 6 enlisted	8	112,600
Classified location, ammo storage facility "B", 1 senior, 1 junior, 6 enlisted	10	138,300
NOF, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 1 senior, 4 junior, 53 enlisted (58 units included in aviation project NAF, Port Lyautey).		
Communication facilities:		
NCF, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands, 5 senior, 26 junior, 265 enlisted	296	5,852,500
NCF, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 3 senior, 14 junior, 105 enlisted	122	2,109,600
Naval Radio facility (R), Kami Seya, Japan, 3 senior, 30 junior, 118 enlisted	151	2,439,700
Yards and dock facilities: 15th Naval District, Canal zone 40 enlisted (acquisition)	40	540,000
CONTINENTAL		
Fleet base facilities:		
Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C., 3 flag	3	81,000
NUSL, New London, Conn. (Fisher Island), 1 junior, 4 enlisted	5	66,600
Marine Corps facilities: MCTC, Twentynine Palms, Calif., 1 flag, 1 senior	2	47,300
Medical facilities:		
Naval hospital, Corona, Calif:		
4 senior, 4 junior (conversion)	8	256,800
15 enlisted	15	
Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass., 15 enlisted	15	192,800
Naval hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex., 2 senior, 8 junior	10	162,100
Supply facilities: Naval fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla., 1 junior	1	15,200
Aviation facilities:		
MCAAS, Mojave, Calif., 5 senior, 25 junior, 132 enlisted	162	2,177,400
MCALF, Edenton, N. C., 5 senior, 15 junior, 85 enlisted	105	1,421,500
NAAS, Chase Field, Beeville, Tex., 2 senior, 5 junior, 33 enlisted	40	540,500
NAAS, Fallon, Nev., 2 senior, 6 junior	8	131,700
NALF, Mayport, Fla., 1 senior, 1 junior, 3 enlisted	5	74,000
NAAS, Whiting Field, Fla., 4 senior, 20 junior	24	385,000
NAAS, Brown Field, Calif., 2 senior, 3 junior, 10 enlisted	15	214,600
NAAS, Sanford, Fla., 2 senior, 3 junior, 8 enlisted	13	188,900
School facilities: NTC, Great Lakes, Ill., 288 enlisted	288	3,700,800

Fiscal year 1956 military public works program—Family housing—Revised June 1, 1955—Continued

UNFUNDED AUTHORIZATION UNDER FISCAL YEAR 1955 MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING ACT, PUBLIC LAW 765, 83D CONG.—APPROPRIATION ONLY REQUIRED

	Units	Amount
Fleet base facilities:		
NS, Key West, Fla., 7 junior, 73 enlisted	80	1,044,500
NSY, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 enlisted	25	321,300
Aviation facilities:		
NAS, Key West, Fla., 1 senior, 4 junior, 15 enlisted	20	273,900
MCAS, Beaufort, S. C., 1 senior, 21 junior, 153 enlisted	175	2,305,600
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla., 1 senior, 12 junior, 77 enlisted	90	1,192,200
NAAS, Glynco, Ga., 13 junior, 67 enlisted	80	1,058,600
School facilities: NSC School, Athens, Ga., 30 junior	30	456,000
Marine Corps facilities:		
MCSC, Albany, Ga., 11 junior, 86 enlisted	97	1,272,300
MCS, Quantico, Va., 3 senior, 104 junior, 193 enlisted	300	4,121,700
Total	3,985	
Sec. 202, Rehabilitation of existing housing		1,218,300
Total		69,451,300

UNIT COST DATA USED IN PRICING PROGRAM

STATESIDE (1.0) BASIC UNIT COSTS [1]

MOQ's:	
Flag officers	$27,000
Senior officers	20,250
Junior officers	15,200
MEMQ's: Enlisted men	12,850

AREA COST FACTORS

Continental United States	1.0
Adak, Alaska	3.0
Argentia, Newfoundland	1.8
Azores	1.5
Hawaii	1.6
Japan	1.2
Kodiak, Alaska	2.5
Port Lyautey, French Morocco	1.3
Spain	1.0
Subic Bay area, Philippine Islands	1.5
Caribbean area	1.4

[1] $35,000-unit maximum, regardless of location.

FUNDING PROGRAM VS. APPROPRIATION REQUEST

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now I would like to have an explanation of the proposal before us as to the $646 million authorization total versus the $530 million appropriation total.

Admiral CLARK. The $646,196,300 is a summation of all urgent projects which we feel must be done this year. We are asking for funding authority for that whole list. We believe, because of circumstances beyond our control, largely, such as the timing of the granting of base rights, the phasing in of facilities with new equipment that is being provided, new high-frequency direction finders, for instance, the timing of our ability to get the land on which these projects are to be constructed—those things add up, from past experience and since they are still beyond our control, to about that much. But we do not know and cannot know—we do not know from day to day, really, in some of those projects—when the advance planning will show that it does not fit into the equipment that has been provided; or we do not know when certain foreign governments which we think will go along with base rights, will grant them. As I say, it is an area that is largely beyond our control.

We believe we will get more defense for our dollars if we are permitted to have this authority to fund any one of these projects, because each one of them should be done this year if we had the power to do it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you take the figure of $646 million and deduct the $530 million it would leave in the category of undeterminable, $116 million. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you are asking the committee to provide that much elasticity in your funding, in order to take care of unknown factors, or undeterminable factors that may prevail and you are confronted with the nonexpenditure of funds presently being asked. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. It also permits us—in fact, it puts a premium on economy; because, even though we plan something carefully, if we are able, as we go through, to make any saving, that permits us to take a certain portion of this saving and perhaps to fund a small project which, if we did not have the authority to fund, we could not do this year but should do this year, because that is the very purpose of these things we submit. As you see there, Mr. Chairman, they are only the urgent ones. We were told to submit only those things which must be undertaken and could no longer be put off.

In spite of that, there are are areas beyond our control where we cannot get started. There is a construction season, for instance, in Argentia. If, for any reason, the contractor cannot assemble the materials, we may not be able to get going on certain projects during the construction season.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, you said it was expected you would have an unobligated balance of $122 million on June 30, 1955. Do you have any later figures that would tend to support the reasonableness of that estimate, either diminishing or increasing it?

Admiral PERRY. I have no further information that would tend to increase or decrease that. We are advertising projects and taking bids right along, and I feel we will come within a reasonable amount of that $122 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You also said that based on probable obligations for 1956, if you get the $530 million requested, you would have an unobligated balance at June 30, 1956, of about $242 million. I want as good an estimate as you can give us of the construction part of that total, and it should be supported by detailed plans and specifications. I think you gave an offhand figure the other day of at least $100 million.

Admiral PERRY. In my statement this morning—and my statement this morning is not based solely on offhand information which I had to give the other day; it is based on a recent recap of what we reasonably anticipate during the forthcoming year—I said we would have $160 million of what we call real construction dollars, with approximately $82 million left over in various reserves that we must hold back.

Now you have asked me to present to you detailed plans and specifications covering the $160 million——

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I asked if those figures were supported by detailed plans and specifications.

Admiral PERRY. With respect to the $160 million which we would have left over, I might state at this point that the entire program,

that is, the $530 million program which we are coming before you with at the present time—with certain exceptions—is supported by advanced planning estimates. When I say "advanced planning estimates," I mean the estimates are based on a thorough engineering study of the individual projects in question and the estimates are arrived at based on local conditions. I feel that the estimates will be within 5 to 10 percent of the ultimate contract price.

This is an example of what we would call advanced planning studies [submitting].

DISTINCTION BETWEEN PREPLANNING AND ACTUAL PLANNING

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the distinction between preplanning and actual planning when a contract is advertised for bids?

Admiral PERRY. By preplanning, I assume you mean the same term I use—advance planning?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same as you have presented to the committee in the booklet you just gave us.

Admiral PERRY. In advance planning, we review the site; we determine the type of structure that will go on that site; we study in a general way what are the foundation conditions and, therefore, we get a fairly accurate estimate of the cost of the foundations. We determine the type of structure, although not necessarily the details of it. In the overall picture it permits us to draw a rather accurate budget estimate.

Now for a project that is to be put out for bids we must have detailed drawings of all the floor plans and elevations; we must have detailed plans of all the electrical wiring, the electrical equipment, and so forth, that must go into that building. While we have established in the advanced planning stage that we would need pile foundations, in the detailed plans we show all the details of that pile foundation. If we have a steel-frame building, we would have to show the construction details of that steel framing, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to clear my thinking, the reason you have to have specific details when you advertise for bids is predicated upon the fact that the contractor would evidently have to know what he was bidding on in order to give a competent competitive bid?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct. He could not do that on the basis of our advanced plan drawings. On our detailed plans and specifications we set down, as the term implies, the exact details of what we expect him to perform when he goes on the job, if he is the successful bidder.

METHODS OF CONTRACTING TO BE USED

Mr. SHEPPARD. At this point in the record, in order that the committee and the House may know the formula of the procedure that is going to be involved in the construction program, and to obviate any difference in concept of the contractual procedure, we did this once before and I am going to ask you for a repetition—when you prepare detailed plans and specifications for the competitive bid formula, then the next step is what—that of calling in 4 or 5 firms for negotiation purposes after you have arrived at the reasonably low bid, or something comparable with the preplanning, and negotiate as you explained before, or do you start out on what is commonly known as a straight

advertised bid with a performance bond attached thereto and then accept the lowest bid?

Admiral PERRY. Our normal procedure, of course, is to have open competitive bidding on any project that we have. That is, anybody who can put up a bid bond and will put up a performance bond if he be the low bidder, will be given the contract. There are no negotiations whatsoever.

I said that is the normal procedure. There are certain projects, and this particularly held true at the time of the outset of the Korean incident, where time was of the essence and we had what we call a limited list of bidders. Now as was pointed out, if we had an airfield pavement project, we did not want a hatchet-and-saw-man to come in and bid on that job and be the low bidder and thereafter be awarded the contract and involve the Government, the Navy and the whole effort in Korea in interminable delays because he did not know his business. Therefore in many cases we went into the practice of having a limited list of bidders. In other words, according to what the type of project was—and I used before an airfield pavement as an example—we knew the people we asked to bid on that job were experienced pavement contractors who had, by performance, shown they could do this job, do it economically and do it expeditiously. But even under that process, if we had 5, 6, or 10 bidders on the list, the award was made to the low bidder.

Under the law that type of contract, arrived at in that way, is known as a negotiated contract, because you do not have completely open bidding. There may be cases, for instance on the renovation and overhaul of a camp or building, where you cannot write detailed plans and specifications and in such a case we would, without doubt, have to go to what we call a truly negotiated contract. We would call in certain representative firms whom we felt were fully competent to do the job and, after careful evaluation of the capabilities of the individual concerns, we would then pick one of them and tell him to go ahead with the job and we would enter into a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee type of contract with him.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, the reason the chairman is bringing this subject out is because about a half a dozen Members of Congress have asked questions relative to the procedure involved, not only in the past tense, but relative to that which is contemplated in the present bill, and I think it is to the advantage of the Members of the House to have that explanation.

Out of the total number of projects that you are presently justifying what percentage of those do you feel will come into the category that might have to be negotiated as against the selected group process?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer that in geographical terms, I think I could do it better than by percentages.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Admiral PERRY. As regards projects within the continental limits of the United States I know of none contained in this present bill that would require negotiation. I am speaking as of this moment. The international situation might change, and if it did we might have to go to different procedures, but as of now I know of nothing within this bill that we would have to negotiate.

I am talking only of the continental United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I understand.

Admiral PERRY. As regards the work overseas, we would not negotiate anything in Guantanamo. We would take open competitive bids, and the same thing applies to Argentia, and the same thing will apply to Kodiak and Adak in Alaska.

We would take bids on work in the Hawaiian Islands.

We now take bids on work in Kwajalein where formerly we did not.

We propose, however, to take bids on work in Guam, where we have not done so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On Guam, is that to be restricted to contractors within the South Pacific area, or is that to be a universal proposition?

Admiral PERRY. It will be open competitive bidding, Mr. Chairman, which would permit any contractor who is an American citizen to bid on the work.

As regards work in the Philippines, the chances are very good that we would continue to let that out as CPFF contracts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Define those initials, please.

Admiral PERRY. Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

We will have work, if the Appropriations Committee sees fit, on Okinawa. I cannot tell you what procedure will be followed on Okinawa because we turn that work over to the Army engineers to be done for us. The Army engineers have the paramount interest in Okinawa, and so they should do all of the work there.

For our work in Japan we take competitive bids. Very few of the American contractors wish to bid on that work because they have found that in most cases they cannot underbid the Japanese contractors.

As regards proposed work in the Azores, again the Army engineers would do the work for us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pardon me, but when the Army engineers do the work for the Navy, you do not stipulate to the Army engineers the procedure that you wish followed. You just let it to their jurisdiction; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, we specify what we want in terms of criteria.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral PERRY. We then turn the money over to them, but we do not tell them how to do the work. We say that we want the job done, but we do not tell them how the job is to be done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do the same criteria and procedures apply when the Air Force and the Army come to the Bureau of Yards and Docks and ask you to represent them through your agency in the construction program?

Admiral PERRY. Insofar as the Army engineers are concerned, and I assume you mean them when you mentioned the Army, our relationship with them has been most excellent and most cooperative. They do just exactly what we would do.

Our experience with the Air Force has been a little different, but it is because of the lack of experience. The relationship has not been the same as it has been with the Army engineers. It is nothing against the Air Force at all when I make that statement. It is merely that they are new to our procedures.

I have left out only one area in which we will be operating, and that is in Spain. There the work will go to the CPFF contractor which we presently have on the job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, summing up the entire situation, from a technical point of view, with the construction responsibility that will be vested in your Department you do not contemplate any difficulties other than the normal, unforeseen eventualities that enter into a program of this magnitude?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions, Mr. Andrews, pertaining to the statements that have been made by the three witnesses who have presented statements? We will go into the details of the projects later.

TOTAL OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. These figures will be in the record, Admiral Perry, but I wanted to ask you the total amount of your authorizations at this time, including the authorization in H. R. 6829 where you figure the authorized totals amount to $731,740,900?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Admiral CLARK. That is after the rescission.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, that is correct, which is $151,400,000?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

URGENT REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe, according to that chart, you say the amount of work that is urgently needed by the Navy Department at this time is $3,800 million?

Admiral CLARK. I did not say urgently; no, sir. We define it, as you will remember, Mr. Andrews, in my statement, we define "urgent" as being that which we feel must be started this year, and that amount is $646,196,300.

Now, the total requirement includes the hatched portion on the chart for fiscal year 1957. The urgently required, when they brought it in that added up for next year to $1.5 billion, but we have not reviewed that yet. That is what the field submitted to us.

Mr. ANDREWS. What does your latest review show your urgent requirements to be?

Admiral CLARK. For this year, sir?

Mr. ANDREWS. In dollars, $1,200 million?

Admiral CLARK. For new authorization, our urgent program after we boiled it down—you are talking about what we have reviewed or have not reviewed?

Mr. ANDREWS. What you have done, as I understand it, is that you have reviewed the urgent requirements for the fiscal year 1955 and this year, and they add up to $1,200 million?

Admiral CLARK. That is right, however in that connection——

Mr. ANDREWS. Now, just a moment before you get away from that. You gave the amount of your urgent requirements as $1,200 million?

Admiral CLARK. That was the amount of the urgent requirements submitted to the Navy Department from the field. We then knowing,

what they did not know, that we were going to go down in personnel, and so forth, in some places, we boiled that down and submitted a smaller program to the Secretary of Defense who approved about $581 million. My Board does the first boiling down. Then the Secretary of the Navy takes a look at it, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then it is your opinion that the amount that you urgently require for the fiscal year 1956, that is, the money that must be spent immediately——

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is $596 million?

Admiral CLARK. In new authorization.

Mr. ANDREWS. And you are covered by that amount of authorization in H. R. 6829?

Admiral CLARK. That is right, sir. That is the new authorization. We are asking this committee for further funding authority to fund some of the previous authorizations which you have not approved.

Mr. ANDREWS. And your request for funds in this bill is $530,345,000?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

FUNDS TO BE AVAILABLE DURING 1956

Mr. ANDREWS. How much unexpended balance will you have at the end of this fiscal year which could be added to the $530 million for construction purposes?

Admiral PERRY. $122 million, unobligated.

Mr. ANDREWS. $122 million even?

Admiral PERRY. Around that; yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, if the Congress appropriates $530,345,000, which is your request before this committee, during the fiscal year 1956 you will have available for public works $652,345,000?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, that is right, sir. That was contained in my statement.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right; thank you. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

AUTHORIZATIONS, APPROPRIATIONS, AND OBLIGATIONS

Mr. OSTERTAG. I cannot help but feel that we are getting a little clearer picture here, and I would like to return first to the point of the statement of Admiral Perry, and I also refer to the statement of Secretary Fogler in order to get the broad overall picture in my mind. As I understand it, funds have been authorized in the neighborhood of $2,191 million from 1948 on; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And appropriations have been made available in the amount of $1,900 million, leaving an unfunded balance of $287 million?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

Now, Admiral, in respect to the $1,900 million, you pointed out that by June 30 of this year you will have obligated all but $122 million.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe it has been pointed out that $151,400,000 previously authorized is available for rescission. If you have obligated all but $122 million, how can you have a rescission of $151 million?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, when you discuss these figures you get into two areas, one of which is authorization, and the other appropriation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I agree with you.

Admiral PERRY. We have had authorizations of $2,191 million thus far.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Maybe I can correct myself by pointing out that the $151 million in rescission would be of the $287 million, which is authorized but not appropriated.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct; yes, sir, Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Am I correct in that?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Now, these total figures do not include family housing during the fiscal year 1956 because, as I understand, it is in the budget for the Defense Department otherwise; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. What is that, sir?

Mr. OSTERTAG. These total figures of authorization amounting to $2,191 million do not include family housing because that figure applies only to that amount which was appropriated directly to the Navy and the family housing heretofore was appropriated to the Defense Department?

Admiral CLARK. We had some odds and ends of family housing right in our public works program over the years.

Last year the Secretary of Defense decided that he would pull those into a package. He took them out of the Public Works bill and put them into the Department of Defense bill, so that that amount is not included here. That was $13 million. To be exact, it was $13,264,700. Now, that was a separate bill, so that when we are talking about our authorization bill, it is really the Secretary of Defense's authorization of which we were given funds to do our part.

VARIATION BETWEEN ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS AND ALLOWANCES UNDER HOUSE BILL

Mr. OSTERTAG. If I understand correctly, the Navy, through its survey and canvassing the field, was requested to apply for $1,200 million as being urgently needed for public works in the Navy, $1,200 million?

Admiral CLARK. That is what the field submitted.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And that on review of the requests from the field it boils down, as really urgent to the tune of $596 million.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. We actually requested ourselves $581 million. The Armed Services Committee of the House added the difference up to $596,140,900. They added an authorization for us to go ahead this year with the Naval Academy airfield, which we had intended to ask for next year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Of the total program which the Navy feels warrants some consideration, it was boiled down that out of the $1,200 million, new authorizations are requested to the tune of $596 million; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Not exactly.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would like to have a clear and correct picture.

Admiral CLARK. Well, actually we submitted to the House a request for $581,197,300 in the House bill, which is all we are working with now. The House Armed Services Committee report deleted $10,141,000 worth of project and we withdrew $7,986,000 worth of projects.

So, there was a grand total of deletions and withdrawals of $18,127,000.

Now, the House also added to our bill the Quantico medical facility, $432,000, and family housing was switched from Camp Pendleton to various approved locations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I assume we will discuss this later.

Admiral CLARK. Anyway, that made a total addition of $33,070,600. So, as I say, we did not ask originally this year for $596 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But you did ask for $581 million?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir, but the bill now has been modified to $596 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then I should correct my statement or question to say that the $1,200 million was boiled down by the Navy itself to $581 million.

Admiral CLARK. $581,197,300.

Mr. FOGLER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement on that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Mr. FOGLER. All of the requests that come into the Navy are reviewed by the various bureaus and are very substantially cut before the requests are finally approved by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary of the Navy. This is done in an attempt to get a budget which seems reasonable under the circumstances. To achieve balance we must consider the urgency of the requirement, at the same time taking a reasonable chance that something is not going to happen tomorrow.

The $1,200 million to the man out in the field who is actually managing a station is urgent, and he is thinking of it entirely in terms of what he wishes to try to do and what can be built.

We in the Department are thinking of it in terms of catching up and appearing with a very substantial request next year for building, yet making progress toward getting these really needed facilities. In all of this there is a certain element of chance that we will get them done before something much worse than the present condition exists.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Well, how would you compare the $1,200 million which you classify as urgent to the $581 million which you have actually requested? Would you call that ultraurgent, or how do you compare the two?

Mr. FOGLER. It has a high priority among these urgencies. It is more needed in 6 months from now than some other items.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, the Navy could use authorizations ultimately of funds to the tune of $1,200 million according to your surveys in the field?

Mr. FOGLER. We could use them very profitably.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ESTIMATED FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR 1956 AND AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. OSTERTAG. Now, if the $530 million which, as I understand it, is the general figure in this appropriation bill, is made available, that does not cover the whole of the $581 million which is authorized in the other bill. Now, putting the figures together, in addition to the $530 million which you are requesting, what is your unexpended balance which may be added to that amount for the program?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, may I draw a distinction between unexpended and unobligated? As I have testified earlier we expect to have an unobligated balance as of the 1st of July of $122 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

Admiral PERRY. We are asking for funding this year in actual cash, in the amount of $530 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is right.

Admiral PERRY. Therefore, at the beginning of the fiscal year, assuming we get the $530 million, we would have unobligated as of the first of this forthcoming fiscal year, or on July 1, 1955, the sum of $652 million.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, on July 1.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, you are going to have, as of the new fiscal year if the Congress appropriates the amount requested, approximately $652 million?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. To be applied against an authorization as of that point of how many millions or billions?

Admiral PERRY. Against $732 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. As of the first of the new year that would be the amount of authorization against appropriations of $652 million?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Consequently, if this appropriation is granted there will be approximately $80 million authorized for which moneys have not yet been made available. Does that complete the picture in figures?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir, not quite.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral will you tell us the amount involved in the difference?

Admiral PERRY. There is a difference of $122 million that we have in there, Mr. Ostertag, which will be used to finance prior authorizations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Well, you have the $122 million that you are carrying over as authorization money.

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; that is appropriations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. All right, we add that to the $530 million, and that gives us $652 million, that is money?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And you say that as of the 1st of July, you will have $731 million in authorization?

Admiral PERRY. That is also correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Now, applying the $652 million against the authorization of $731 million, just what do you have?

Mr. FOGLER. That is correct, Mr. Ostertag.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, you are right, Mr. Ostertag, except that the $122 million has already been charged against prior authorizations.

The new appropriation, therefore, is the only additional money that may be applied against any unfunded authorization.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are any of the funds requested in this program to be obligated for during the fiscal year 1956, based on planning that has already been made, and for which moneys have been appropriated, or does this include moneys which are going to be used for advance planning and final planning and specifications, and any other preliminary steps necessary?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

For instance, for the $122 million which is unobligated, detailed plans and specifications are well underway for a large proportion of that.

You will note in my statement I said that of the $122 million we had only $65 million of hard construction money. The plans and specifications for them are generally all underway. Also, we have used advance planning money to put under design contract much of this work which is coming out in the present appropriation bill.

We have underway at the present time—and we have just gotten them underway within the past 3 weeks—the detailed plans and specifications for approximately $150 million worth of work included in H. R. 6829.

METHOD OF ARRIVING AT BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. OSTERTAG. How did you arrive at the figure, or the cost factors, involved in this appropriation bill?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, we do not develop and draw the detailed plans and specifications. Nevertheless, we have advance planning in the field where we hire architects and engineers to make a thorough engineering investigation of the project, and then to make a sound engineering estimate of what the job is going to cost. Those are the figures in this present bill, the figures that you see there. These are certain exceptions.

REASON FOR RESCISSIONS RECOMMENDED

Mr. OSTERTAG. In your statement you pointed out that all of this planning and all of these requirements are based on very careful surveying and minute checking against your requirements and needs, yet we are now being told, and properly so, that there is $151 million in the process of rescission.

How does it happen that you are involved in a rescission of $151 million if you follow the policy and practice of the careful surveying that you point out is part of this program? Is it a new policy that accounts for the difference?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, I think it would be better for Admiral Clark to answer that question, sir.

Admiral CLARK. The rescissions are made for authority which we no longer need. For instance, suppose we had a certain base that we were going to get in the Mediterranean, and we got authority to build it, but we were never able to get those base rights which were necessary to build it. In the meantime we decided that we would have to go to another base, and we got new authority, and we rescinded the authority for that other previous base.

The minute it becomes the decision that we cannot go through with it we immediately ask Congress to rescind that authority.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then the record, in reference to the rescission of $151,400,000 did not intend to leave the impression that this was oversubscribed, but rather it is the result of inadequate planning estimates brought about because the program was shifted, through no fault of the Navy, but by way of circumstances which were beyond your control, is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is generally correct. It has nothing to do with the engineering plan.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Well, I want to know.

Admiral CLARK. Occasionally we do have more authority than needed, where we are able to do it cheaper than anticipated, and we will rescind any little amounts that are left from that.

EFFECT OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE OF ESTIMATES UPON CONTRACT BIDS

Mr. OSTERTAG. Previously reference was made to not only the planning, but methods as to how the estimates are arrived at and how the contracts are made and the bidding. Is it not possible, Admiral, for anyone outside of the Navy or the Government in official circles to have any access to the figures which might indicate what your estimate of cost might be of a given project or a given part of a contract, for which you have asked and have received funds? In other words, if I were a contractor and knew how much money you had I could very well bid properly in my own interest, could I not?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, this bill is public knowledge. You cannot keep the contractors from knowing what we have estimated on a job.

Mr. OSTERTAG. For the overall broad amount?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. The last item here is for several buildings, all inclusive. No, they would not have ready access to individual detailed estimates.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How would he arrive at those figures?

Admiral PERRY. The contractor knows to whom we have given the architectural engineer contracts. He has drawn up the figures he expects to bid, and if he goes to the architect-engineer with a particular project and says, "What did you estimate this job for?" the architect-engineer will tell him. All of them know exactly.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is not this a costly procedure for the Government?

Admiral PERRY. No, I do not gfeel that it is, Mr. Ostertag. A reputable contractor is going to put in his estimate or bid based on what it is going to cost him to do the work, regardless of what we might have said in this program or any other program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you yield there, Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes, Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This has occurred on many occasions, has it not, Admiral, where certain geographical conditions enter into a project that will either decrease or increase the estimates through publicity?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, that would have been true possibly 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral PERRY. By employing local architects and engineers, as we are now doing, to furnish advance planning and budget esti-

mates, we are getting good onsite cost estimates reflecting local conditions regarding labor, material and other factors.

Mr. OSTERTAG. My inquiry was directed to the fact that the contractor knows by virtue of the record and architectural and other planning factors are concerned that a given sum has been made available for a given project.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Suppose your people in planning and estimating the project put the figure high for the reason that while it is common practice for all Government agencies to ask for more than is actually required they do for the reason that a bird in the hand is worth more than two in the bush, so rather than come back for more later they have estimated high. Let us say that competition is not too keen at the time, and, therefore, the contractor by virtue of the moneys which are made available on your estimate gets a pretty good deal. How can that be safeguarded against? What is the problem if any in connection with these contracts?

Admiral PERRY. The thing is I think that the condition of which you are speaking could only come about if there were collusion among the individual contractors.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not referring to collusion in any way. I am merely talking about the moneys available, and the general practice of where the contractor knows how much money is available. If there is not too much competition, a contractor can bid within that amount and get a pretty good deal assuming your estimates have been high in the first place.

Admiral PERRY. Remember, he must be the low bidder in every instance.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes; I understand that.

Admiral PERRY. Conceivably what you say might happen. I do not think it does happen, but conceivably it could happen. It certainly does not happen today. The construction business today is the most cutthroat business that I have ever seen. As a matter of fact, you will find $50,000 jobs where we will receive 15 to 20 bids.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Collusion among bidders is a possibility.

Admiral PERRY. That is what I am talking about, Mr. Ostertag. If they knew that there were only three bidders presenting bids on a job they could get together and fix the bids.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, the point I am trying to make is more or less the possibility that the Government is a victim of a system of public information and perhaps by virtue of certain circumstances which you cannot control, it lends itself to high bidding rather than low bidding.

Admiral PERRY. May I say at this point, Mr. Ostertag that the estimates which we have put in here, have been based on what we considered sound engineering judgment. There is no attempt whatsoever to pad any of the figures that are presented, I can assure you.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Perhaps not in this instance, but the record and history shows that it has been done.

Mr. FOGLER. Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment on that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I think the statement really merits comment.

Mr. FOGLER. Yes, sir.

To provide additional safeguards, something over 40 percent of these projects, Congressman, have been reviewed by a group of experienced men who have in total 175 years of experience in construction, architecture, engineering, and business management.

It is our intent that all of the projects in the program will be so reviewed.

Now, if I may go off the record, I would like to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record for the balance of the gentleman's statement.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the gentleman finished?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES—END OF 1956

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, you indicated that you would have perhaps $100 million in plans and specifications at the end of the fiscal year 1956, out of the $160 million so-called construction dollars estimated unobligated at that date. What would the status be generally of the remaining $60 million relative to the detailed plans and specifications?

Admiral PERRY. I think of the remaining amount, sir, we would have moneys tied up in projects where we have not acquired title to the land because of various reasons. You might have projects with changing conditions where they alter the criteria. Admiral Clark mentioned possible base rights problems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Entering into the situation?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; entering into the situation.

PROJECTS NOT REQUESTED BY NAVY FOR 1956

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many projects did the House Armed Services Committee put into H. R. 6829 that were not requested by the Navy?

I would like to have you name the projects with their geographical location. If it is off the record give it to us anyway, and the amount of money involved.

Admiral CLARK. Annapolis, Md., fill-in of Dewey and Santee Basins on the Severn River.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just give the total amounts involved and the locations of each.

Admiral CLARK. $3,785,000 for the fill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the next one?

Admiral CLARK. Annapolis, extension of Bancroft Hall, $7,500,000.

Naval air facility, Annapolis, $16,900,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just a moment. That first one was one project, or was that the total amount of money which you gave for a series of projects?

Admiral CLARK. They were three projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Three projects?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, name the next project if you have completed Annapolis.

Admiral CLARK. Quantico, Va., Marine Corps medical facility, $432,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that all?

Admiral CLARK. That is all there are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the total, in money, is how much, covering all of the projects you have enumerated which were put in by the committee and not presented by the Navy?

Admiral CLARK. $28,617,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, is that $28,617,000 reflected in the appropriation requests which are presently before the committee?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the time that the committee put them in the bill and up to the time that the mathematics were passed on for presentation to the committee, how much time did you have for engineering those details?

Admiral CLARK. None. These were estimates. You remember that Admiral Perry said there were certain exceptions where there had not been advance planning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I remember what he said. Now I am trying to pin some of them down.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. That is some of them right there, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral, as Assistant Comptroller for the Navy, do you feel in any better status to justify the requirements of the Navy now than at the time you made the presentation for the requirements under the authorization bill? What has changed in your requirements system other than the fact that these requirements are in the bill by the committee wherein you might include them more now than at that time?

Admiral SMITH. The amount of the appropriation request has not changed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has not changed?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you do not need those projects any more now than you did at the time you appeared before the legislative committee to make your presentation and that never revealed the requirement?

Admiral SMITH. Not to my knowledge, although it has been indicated that these projects were considered for 1957.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Considered by whom?

Admiral SMITH. By Admiral Clark, who said they were considered for 1957.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They were considered within the Navy?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By somebody in the Navy where they were not presented for consideration and for authorization purposes; that is correct; is it not?

Admiral SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

PROJECTS DELETED FROM H. R. 6829

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, what items did you request from the House Armed Services Committee that were deleted by that committee?

Admiral CLARK. The Armed Services Committee deleted, or, rather, the report of the Armed Services Committee deleted the Port

Chicago land acquisition, $1,688,000; the Dahlgren, Va., land acquisition, $200,000; and Camp Pendleton, Calif., a whole list of projects, totaling $6,098,000. Now, out of that $6 million the biggest sum of all was for housing. They transferred it from Camp Pendleton to 5 other stations, because of the water litigation, and Mr. Vinson said because of that he would not approve the use of Camp Pendleton and we would have to transfer $4,453,600 to 5 other locations where we had a requirement for family housing this year.

Now, the Navy itself withdrew five projects during the course of the hearings.

At Keyport, Wash., we withdrew a request for a passivating facility, $196,000 because it was so urgent that we had to do it under other authority. It is under "Facilities, Navy".

At Indian Head, Md. we have a surveillance magazine, $123,000. Also, we are going to do that under "Facilities, Navy".

The next is Squantum, Mass., radio facility, $50,000. We are eliminating that because we are going to reroute our communication facilities, so we will not have to use Squantum.

Also the Elk Hills pipeline for $8 million. The latest study by the Secretary of Defense showed that we will now have sufficient refining capacity so that we will not have a pipe from one place to another out there, which the Secretary of Defense originally told us we should request.

In the trust territories of the Pacific we had $1,772,000 of authorization which we are obligating and do not need new authority, so that our total deletions that we requested were $10,141,000. I will have to add these up if you wish to get it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to have the total explanation on the record, please.

Admiral CLARK. $3,534,000 was not approved by the House Armed Services Committee; $10,141 was withdrawn by the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, with regard to the justification of projects that was made within the committee, how much would you be injured in the pursuing of your present plan, militarily speaking, if this committee were to eliminate those projects, insofar as appropriation requirements are concerned?

Admiral CLARK. We would be very badly affected if we did not get the land acquisition at Dahlgren, Va. We have retained that justification sheet in our books, sir, and we will explain it with the the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance here, and explain just what that means for us, or I can do it for him now.

We have a rocket facility there where we are going to test 2.75 inch and 5-inch rockets, not only for the Navy, but for the Air Force. The adjacent land which we need is for safety distances. In fact, at the present moment the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance I do not think dares to do all of the testing that he should do as long as that piece of land is in the hands of this man who owns it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are telling me now is that you think that that extracurricular matter put in by the committee was essential?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it was not essential at the time that you made your presentation to that committee upon the same premise that prevails today? What I am trying to do here is to establish in my

questioning specifically not the transfers that they made in their authority, but the fact that the committee put in the projects that you have enumerated to the extent of so many dollars as you have outlined them?

Admiral CLARK. You are talking about the projects the committee added?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; my whole question is addressed to that.

Admiral CLARK. It was our intention to put all of these projects in next year, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. Most of them were added as a result of the visit by the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, on which members of Congress were represented, as you know, sir, and they felt that now we should not further delay and on their firsthand look they felt that we were perhaps proceeding too deliberately.

One of the differences between what you see there on the chart is the solid red and the yellow. They are not necessarily things which have been thrown out. They have very often been delayed, and it is a matter of relative urgency in timing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present legal status of the controversy on the water case in California, as it affects Camp Pendleton?

Admiral CLARK. Admiral Nunn perhaps is the best qualified person to answer that, and the second best qualified person to answer will be General Allen who will be before you in a few minutes to justify the Marine Corps program. Captain McKinney has some knowledge of that also. Would you prefer to wait until General Allen comes on?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not care what source I get my information from, just so I get it.

Admiral CLARK. With your permission we will bring that up when General Allen comes on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, this Committee will stand adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

SHIPYARD FACILITIES, CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the item reflected under "Shipyard facilities, continental," in which you have a total request of $51,718,900.

Admiral CLARK. Before we go to the line items, did you wish me to make any explanation as to what these figures mean?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to have you make such statement as may be pertinent to shipyard facilities in the continental United States, at this time, and we will pick up the detail at the completion of your statement.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SHIPS

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I have a general statement form the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, which I would like to submit for the record at this point, or read it, as you wish.

(Statement is as follows:)

Statement of Rear Adm. A. G. Mumma, Chief, Bureau of Ships With Regard To Fiscal Year 1956 Class I Public Works Projects

1956 PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

The Bureau of Ships public works program for fiscal year 1956 has these objectives:

First, to provide urgently required facilities for the prosecution of research in the field of mine countermeasures (searching out characteristics that may be used in defeating all types of mines); and better designs for antisubmarine surface vessels and aircraft carriers, with better controls, maneuverability, and seakeeping qualities at higher speeds under various sea states, and for submarines to provide them with these same advantages when submerged or on the surface. It also provides urgently required administrative office space for the expanded mine countermeasures research program and for a building to house a computer in order to solve major research and design problems in minesweeping, electronics (including the fields of radio, radar, and sonar), hydrodynamics and nuclear propulsion.

Second, to replace certain piers and quaywalls at key shipyards which were originally constructed of untreated timber and/or located on fresh fill. These piers and quaywalls are in a dilapidated and hazardous condition and are required for current work, for berthing of the reserve fleet, and in advance of mobilization; for, should M-day occur prior to replacement, there would be no time then to replace them and the mobilization effort would be unacceptably delayed. Shipyards affected are Boston, Norfolk, San Francisco, and Mare Island.

Third, to provide urgently needed modernized operational facilities, such as blast cleaning, electric power, process steam, drydock dewatering pumps, and the relocation of the minecraft base from its present location on the Ashley River at Charleston, S. C., to another Government-owned site nearer the Charleston Naval Shipyard offering better operational opportunities and considerable operational savings. These facilities are military requirements and, in many instances, amortize themselves in less than 10 years. The self-liquidating projects are those to improve the powerplant at Boston, the blast cleaning and surface treatment facility at Mare Island, and the steam test plant at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

Fourth, to obtain through purchase certain parcels of land necessary to protect the Government's investment in a national industrial reserve shipyard, to provide sites for research facilities, and to acquire tidelands now being filled which are required for the orderly development of the San Francisco naval shipyard and to protect the Government from vastly increased expenditures for these tidelands if acquired even 1 or 2 years hence. Sites for research projects will provide facilities for the development of the minesweeping program, tracking and observational facilities for test and evaluation of mine countermeasures equipment under development, and for radio and radar communications wave propagation studies.

Fifth, to provide training, recreation and messing facilities and Navy exchange privileges to officers and men in isolated locations in order to increase efficiency and morale.

Sixth, to provide housing for 1 officer and 4 enlisted men who must remain on an island location to provide surveillance over valuable Government property, and to provide housing for 25 key enlisted men at the naval shipyard, Philadelphia. (Public Law 765, 83d Cong. authorized the 25 units at the naval shipyard, Philadelphia).

Seventh, to provide facilities for sound search stations, a classified project.

To meet these objectives, $51,775,900 are requested in new appropriations. Included are 30 items at 7 naval shipyards, 4 laboratories, 1 naval station, 1 naval industrial reserve shipyard, the minecraft base Charleston, fleet activities, Sasebo, and the sound search project at various locations.

Detailed justifications have been submitted for each project. In addition, we have a number of photographs, maps and charts which may give a better appreciation of the projects themselves, the things we are trying to accomplish, or the conditions we are trying to correct.

FORMAT OF THE JUSTIFICATIONS

Mr. Sheppard. I would like to have you make your explanation of the justification and any statement you may have dealing with shipyard facilities in the continental United States, please.

Admiral CLARK. You have before you three Navy public works justification books. The first one covers nonclassified projects. The first two pages of volume 1 are summaries of the authorization and appropriation requests. The books are arranged by classes of projects. The name of the class is printed on the tabs protruding beyond the book cover. These are "Shipyard facilities, class 1," "Fleet base facilities, class 2", and so on through the 11 classes represented in this program. Volume 1 contains justifications of continental projects for the first three classes; volume 2 covers continental projects for the remaining 8 classes, and volume 3 covers overseas projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That, however, comes under the title of classified information, does it not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Immediately following the light yellow tab page are the index and justifications for continental stations. The blue tab page is followed by the index and justifications for overseas stations. For convenience of the members of the committee, the location of each station for which projects are included in the program is printed on the tab of the cover sheet for the justifications. Within each class the justification sheets are arranged alphabetically by location. The family housing items appear in the book in alphabetical sequence by location. In the book of justifications that was made up separately, because the Secretary of Defense at one time expected to have a separate bill, and then we sliced it in at each station where there is housing, and the last item under that tab is housing. At stations where there are also regular public works items, justification for the housing follows immediately after the public works justifications.

The justification sheets are presented in a format designed to afford ready answers to questions that normally arise when various stations are under discussion and to give details of the projects requested for the stations. For example, the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H., is divided into five parts as shown by the roman numerals. Line I shows the name and location of the activity; line II shows the mission; line III shows the date it was established, the area in acres, whether owned or leased; the personnel strength, officer, enlisted and civilian, and the present strength is what was on board when this book was written. The planned strength is for the end of fiscal year 1957. That is our advance planning, and you can see from that whether we are increasing the personnel on board, or decreasing it.

Line IV shows the plant value of land and structures as of January 1, 1954. That is not replacement value; that is cost value.

The second item is funded construction not in the plant account. That includes public works projects completed but not yet added to the plant account; public works under contract but not complete, and public works funded but not yet under contract. Everything that has been taken up on the plant account at that station is item 2.

Item 3 is the existing unfunded authorization for that station.

Item 4 is what we propose to ask authorization for, or have asked authorization for, in 1956.

Item 5 is appropriations that are requested, and item 6 is our estimated future appropriations required. I think the representative of each bureau, in case you are interested in what that amount

consists of, can tell you some of the larger projects they have planned for the station in any case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you completed your statement pertaining to the constitution of the items?

Admiral CLARK. I would like to invite the attention of the committee to one more thing, that these books as they are now presented omit certain projects which may appear after the House and Senate have acted and we have an authorization bill—indeed, they were requested of the Appropriations Committee; they did not appear in the House report, but we do not have yet any Senate action, nor have we actually any House action; so, if I may, I will simply read or submit for the record what the projects were which we requested, which do not appear in the House report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Suppose you insert it in the record at this point.

Admiral CLARK. All right. That includes the Marine Corps base at Camp Pendleton, Calif.; the Naval Proving Grounds at Dahlgren, Va., and the Naval Magazine at Port Chicago, Calif.

I can submit the justifications for those projects in case you would like to look them over.

(The matter referred to was submitted to the committee.)

NAVAL SHIPYARD, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the first item "Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.," where you are requesting a total of $8,441,000. Present the justification for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. The shipyard at Boston maintains and overhauls ships in the fleet of all types and categories. It also maintains and berths ships in the reserve fleet. This year they have a firm commitment to overhaul 50 combatant ships and to outfit 10 new vessels.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have established a new title under "Naval Shipyard, Boston" and I note at this installation the plant value is $80,111,657; funded construction not in the plant value, $6,361,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $8,441,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $8,441,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $55,696,000.

Now I would like to ask you for an explanation of the $55,696,000 in the estimated future appropriation request in its relation to those already presented to the committee for its consideration.

Admiral CLARK. Admiral Cronin of the Bureau of Ships, I believe, has the list of the items that go to make up that $55 million.

Admiral CRONIN. I have a list of those projects which I will be glad to submit, or to read the items, as you wish.

We have reconstruction of drydock at South Boston, $18 million, which is in next year's program; replace wooden piers continuation of present project in future fiscal years, $12 million. We have two items on that, as a matter of fact, each of $12 million. Then we have improvement of west jetty, South Boston Annex, $9 million; new construction of an engineering building, $4 million; improvement of woodworking shop, $1 million; deepen drydock No. 5, which is a construction dock, $1,200,000. Those are typical items. The other items are smaller than those. The sum total is about $56 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume insofar as the delineation at the bottom of the page I have before me under item 1, where I find the following—

Demolish old pier; new piers; quay apron; dredging; electrical and mechanical services; on-shore crane and railroad trackage—

and so forth, that those have all been evaluated upon the premise of necessity and as to dollar value. Is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. As regards necessity, yes, sir. The advance planning of that particular item was done by Weldon, Harding & Buchanan, of Boston, Mass., who are outstanding engineers, within the last year at a cost of $18,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have some pictures displayed on the easel. What do those pictures indicate?

Admiral CLARK. That shows the borers have eaten away the underpinning and the pilings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the considerable deterioration reflected in the pictures you have just exhibited, do you consider that those particular parts of the yard depicted there have reached a point where they are unsafe for operational purposes?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you plan to replace with wooden piers?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; we do not. We plan to replace with steel and reenforced concrete.

Mr. ANDREWS. How old are those piers?

Admiral CRONIN. Those two piers were built in 1905.

Admiral CLARK. The most recent piers, Nos. 2, 3, and 4 were built in 1905; No. 8 was built in 1835; No. 9 was built in 1835.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are they wooden piers?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. They have been repaired, patched up, the piling has been renewed, but marine borer action has been increasing.

Admiral PERRY. As a matter of fact, the marine borers did not show up in New England waters until in the thirties. Presumably there had never been any infestation in those waters until 20 years ago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice here under subitem F you have "Onshore crane and railroad trackage." Is that a combination trackage for the crane, plus the actual switching trackage involved there?

Admiral CRONIN. That is correct; that is the whole trackage job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has happened to the previous trackage you have had there? Has that disintegrated by usage?

Admiral CRONIN. The rails we have on the piers now are for railroad car type cranes. This is to tie the new piers in with the crane system with wide tracks, which can be accommodated by the new and wider trackage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to use new steel?

Admiral CRONIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the size of steel there presently? I presume it was rather light at the time those tracks were originally constructed.

Admiral CRONIN. The loading of the piers now is approximately 400 pounds per square foot. We intend to go up to 1,200 pounds per square foot and, to take care by the cranes out there of 2 ships abreast. There will be a longer reach for the cranes, and also 50-ton crane trackage in place of the present 10-ton railroad type.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the parlance of the railroad, what type steel will that be—60-pound steel; 70-pound steel; 100, or what? You have given it to me on a footage basis. I want it delineated on a basis for my understanding.

Admiral CRONIN. May I ask Admiral Perry to answer that?

Admiral PERRY. I do not have the exact weight per running foot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is marine steel?

Admiral PERRY. It would be new steel. I rather imagine it would be 130 pounds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. How will that new crane compare with the big ones you have at San Francisco and Brooklyn Navy Yards?

Admiral CRONIN. This will compare favorably with the largest portal cranes we have, but won't compare with the big bridge cranes and the larger battleship turret cranes. It won't be anything like that. This will be a crane we can move along the tracks.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the name of the crane at San Francisco?

Admiral PERRY. The hammerhead?

Admiral CRONIN. It is a movable crane.

Admiral PERRY. It is a bridge crane.

Captain SPRINGER. It is a bridge crane.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next budget item 2 is "Improve power steam plant" and so forth. You are asking for a total of $1,650,000. Can you provide us with the explanation for this requirement as briefly as you can?

Admiral CLARK. This is the replacement of two old boilers in the new steam powerplant. This project also is a second increment of a replacement and rehabilitation job. In this case, Congress authorized the first increment in 1952 and to complete the work we must replace 2 old boilers now there, 32 years old, with 1 large new one, together with the necessary equipment, piping, alterations, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the text on that item I find for boiler foundation and building alteration you are asking $428,000. What is the reason for that figure?

Admiral PERRY. The building and foundations for the old boilers are not satisfactory to take the new one we are going to put in there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the existing foundations do not meet the requirement in weight?

Admiral PERRY. That is right. And $428,000 includes money for the removal of the old boilers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice in the justifications you say:

> The item will result in an annual saving of $199,400, sufficient to amortize the cost in 8.3 years. The estimated total net savings over the anticipated 30-year life are $4,332,000.

How do you arrive at the anticipated savings; what is the formula procedure, please?

Captain SPRINGER [exhibiting chart]. This chart shows the project cost of $1,650,000; it shows an anticipated annual saving of $199,400, and the project will amortize itself in about 8.3 years. Considering that the facility will have an estimated life of about 30 years, deducting the cost of the project, we get an anticipated total net saving over the estimated useful life of $4,332,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course that saving is generated upon the premise of utilization and duration as against the existing facility in its present depleted condition?

Captain SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not take into account any hypothetical value of the turning over of the crane if you do not go ahead with this work, which is all problematical but could happen, but is not considered as part of the amortization figure you have referred to. Is that correct?

Admiral CRONIN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice an item described as "Rebuild 125-ton-capacity ash silo." What are you doing in the silo operation at that place?

Admiral PERRY. That is for ash removal. Ashes are dumped into the silo, or are forced in there under pressure, and then trucks come along under the silo and pick up the ashes at the silo's base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What disposition is being made at this base with the residue of ashes you have referred to? In other words, is that ash sold to anybody other than for the purpose of just eliminating it, or do you just get it out of circulation?

Admiral CRONIN. I believe it is used for fill. I am not sure whether it is transferred just for the purpose of getting rid of it. I am not sure whether it is actually sold at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you contemplating doing under the new fuel oil system and the improvements you propose to make to the extent of $204,000?

Admiral CLARK. New boilers will be erected so that they can be used with either fuel or oil.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is your fuel capacity underground in that area?

Admiral CRONIN. It is underground.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you use a pump system instead of gravity?

Admiral CRONIN. Yes, sir.

Admiral PERRY. This item has been advanced planned within the past 9 months by Charles T. Main, at Boston, Mass., at a cost of $2,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions pertaining to the item just referred to?

Mr. ANDREWS. I have no questions.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Naval shipyard, Puget Sound, on Sinclair Inlet, Bremerton, Wash.," where you are asking for $200,000.

Admiral CLARK. This project proposes the construction of a notch at the head of the drydock No. 5, to provide sufficient lengthwise clearance and work area to accomplish overhaul of the new carriers. A movable bridge will also be required so that cranes may be moved around the tracks nearest the head of the drydock when being used for smaller class ships, so as to reach the forward part of the deck. We request authorization for this project in the amount of $200,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has that project appeared before this committee on a previous occasion?

Admiral CLARK. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Admiral CRONIN. I think not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps I have it confused. The other instance was trackage to accommodate certain ships going into the yard.

Admiral CLARK. That is a trackage extension. This is actually cutting a notch to permit the Forrestal class carrier to go in and have a working area at the forward part and at the after part of the ship.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you have completed this development, will that be the only yard on the west coast capable of handling that tonnage ship?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What other yards will have the same capability?

Admiral CLARK. The San Francisco yard and the Long Beach shipyard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we do have a diversification?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The plant value at this installation is $87,303,994; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,997,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $200,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $200,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $49,625,000.

Would you please address yourself to the future appropriation required for this item? Pick out about 3 or 4 of the larger projects.

Admiral CRONIN. The building for electronics, electrical and ordnance shop, is $13,178,000; engineering building, including necessary land acquisition, is $8,500,000; continuation of development of heavy storage area is $1,500,000; fire protection for drydocks is a little over $1 million. Those are the main items.

We have a project for 1957 also of $28,600,000 for a new drydock.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the urgency of this particular project?

Admiral CLARK. The original purpose is to have a capability of overhauling the largest class carriers in the Pacific Northwest. It is one of the few deepwater yards and part of their regular workload is to overhaul carriers. And now with the new *Forrestals* coming out, we should have this notch so that we can get them in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the time element involved in completing the construction of the project? I am speaking of that as of the moment and not that extended into the future.

Admiral PERRY. We estimate we will be able to make the architect-engineering award on August 20 of this year and the plans and specifications will be completed in 90 days; that we would make the construction award the 1st of January 1956, and time for completion of construction would be 270 days, or 9 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this appropriation request been engineered with the same attention as the one previously referred to?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. This project was advanced planned by Smith & Murray, of Tacoma, Wash., within the past 6 months at a cost of $2,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions pertaining to this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral, could you service in the drydock at Bremerton the *Forrestal* class carrier at the present time without this additional work?

Admiral CLARK. We could get her in, but we could not work on the bow or stern very efficiently. We have not the space.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you planning this same type of work at any of the other yards?

Admiral CRONIN. No, sir; this is the only one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I have no questions.

DAVID W. TAYLOR MODEL BASIN, CARDEROCK, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "David W. Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md." wherein you are asking for $14,302,000. Please present your explanation for that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. This requirement is broken down into three items. The first is for a rotating arm maneuvering basin for $12,020,000. The advent of the new high-speed submarine has developed a requirement for facilities at the David W. Taylor Model Basin, to provide information for use in designing submarines and antisubmarine surface ships. The use of larger and faster carrier-based aircraft also requires very accurate predictions of the motions of the carrier in a seaway. It is proposed to solve these problems by experiments for which we have two kinds of facilities needed. The first is a rotating arm and maneuvering basin in which measurements can be made of the hydrodynamic forces involved and, second, a maneuvering basin in which we can measure the trajectory which results in the application of rudders and other control devices at various speeds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This installation shows a plant value of $15,792,630; funded construction not in the plant value, $2,406,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $14,302,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $14,302,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $4,745,000.

May we have a brief explanation as to the anticipated or future appropriation requests, if you please?

Admiral CRONIN. For future years we plan a metalworking shop and rehabilitation of space, $2,120,000; we have a new supply building planned, at $600,000; technical service building, $315,000; cafeteria building, $270,000, and wax and plastic model shop, $295,000. Those are the largest items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those items you are projecting into the future will not slow down the activities presently in your appropriation request by not having them now; is that correct?

Admiral CRONIN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they will fall into the category of requirements in due time?

Admiral CRONIN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This particular plant—I have had the pleasure of being out there on a couple of occasions—is being utilized for the purpose of proving certain factors involved in ship construction, and so forth?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. And it is particularly for the new submarines that we need this additional facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have delineated that on the chart over here.

Admiral CLARK. The high-speed submarines require more accurate knowledge of directional stability and control. As you can see from the red figure, as the speed goes up, if you do not have very accurate knowledge, the man will give a down rudder when you only have a few hundred feet in which it is safe, and they are liable to go down to a point where the hull will not stand the water pressure and will crush. Conversely, if making an attack at high speed and he gives a little too much up rudder, it will come out of the water and be exposed to the enemy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are doing is to develop an operational technique which will later be accentuated by the shakedown practice?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will still preserve and still go through the shakedown for practical determination; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Admiral PERRY. This item has been advanced planned within the past 9 months by Sverdrup & Parcel, St. Louis, Mo., at a cost of $62,395.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The second item has to do with "Computer building" in which you are asking for a total appropriation of $288,000. Please present the justification for that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. This is for a new building to house a large-scale, high-speed electronic computer and auxiliary equipment and provide office space for technical and administrative personnel to handle that operation. This building is planned for January 1956, in order to be available at the expected delivery date of the computer for which $1,700,000 has been requested in the Navy's annual budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would define "collateral." I presume, as indicated here, it means just what it says in the definition.

Admiral PERRY. In this instance this is the CO–2 fire-protection system for the computer machine.

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advanced planned by John M. Walton, Arlington, Va., at a cost of $3,350 within the past 6 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is No. 3 "Water tunnel" and this is the third increment. You are asking for $4,554,000. Please explain the requirement there.

Admiral CLARK. This is the third and last project for the David Taylor Model Basin. Through research we propose to conduct at this water tunnel we expect to improve propeller design so as to reduce the operating noise to one-third of the present noise. This will permit our ships to operate at twice the present speed without detection and also reduce about one-third the present range of detection. This 36-inch variable pressure water tunnel is designed for quiet operation.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the title "Research Facilities," this $3,725,000, I presume, is required to accomplish the end result you have just described to us off the record; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, insofar as this pertains to your department, has it been engineered with the same technique as the projects you previously referred to?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. This water tunnel has been advanced planned within the past year by Seeley, Stevenson, Value & Knechel, of New York City, at a cost of $67,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice you want three buildings, the one under item 1 at a unit cost of $23.60 a square foor; the building under item 2 at $13.39 a square foot, and the building under item No. 3 at $12.21 a square foot. Why is there a difference there between the square-foot cost?

Admiral PERRY. In the first instance, Mr. Andrews, you have a building which is 692 feet long by 275 feet wide. It will be of steel construction with a continuous arch structure and will include the basin as well as the model room, the electrical equipment room, the test setup, design and sanitary facilities, but will include no office space. It is rather intricate building including the basin itself. The cost of the building includes the construction of the water basin. In the computer building, you just have a conventional structure.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then the equipment in the building is more responsible for the increased cost than the building itself?

Admiral PERRY. The equipment, if you wish to call it that, if you call the basins equipment; yes, sir. As soon as you begin to build a tank in which to hold water, you run up the cost of the building.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This is known as a model basin, is it not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you have similar facilities on the Pacific coast?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you require them there? Would it not be a practical matter for the Navy to maintain facilities there?

Admiral CLARK. I do not believe we could afford to duplicate anything of this expense at the present time. I do not think you have any plans for that?

Admiral CRONIN. That is correct. One basin of this type fulfills our requirements.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And the cost of the ships and other operations that take place on the West coast would apply on the East coast?

Admiral CRONIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And therefore it is a matter of experimentation, testing and research?

Admiral CRONIN. Yes, sir, and the projects would apply to both places.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Under item 3, "Water tunnel," I think it should be made clear, or at least I would like to make sure I understand correctly, that this budget item is $1,994,000 requested in money. However, the total cost of this project is $4,554,000. Am I correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, this is the first installment of a project which will run——

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; this is the last installment. This is the third and last increment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This is the third and last increment?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, this $1,994,000 will complete this job?

Admiral CLARK. Will give us a usable facility; yes, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item "Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.", where you are requesting $427,000 for land acquisition. I would like an explanation of that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. This reserve shipyard is currently in use and is needed for the repair of both the Navy and commercial ships. During 1954, Navy repair work in the amount of $1,202,357 was accomplished. Immediately after mobilization, we expect to construct new ships for both the Navy and Army at this yard. However, the Navy does not own the underlying land. We need to continue to operate those facilities. It is necessary to purchase this land, because the owner will not continue to lease it. We think it is required for the Navy's current operations, and acquisition must be obtained in order to retain this facility and the Navy's improvements thereon which originally cost about $2 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you also include in there "Payment for displaced facilities, $125,000." I assume that is necessary for you to procure the land in order to get those facilities out of the way for your construction requirements. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; also, because if we do not buy his facilities he loses their use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, logically, you are buying property with a home, barn and shops on it, to draw a parallel?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And if you are going to buy the land, obviously you have to make some compensation for the buildings you are not going to use, or may later use, but in either respect the cost still applies?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under Item 1, you reflect plant value, land and construction, of $3,725,000; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $427,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $427,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Are there any questions pertaining to that item?

Mr. ANDREWS. How long have you occupied this land, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. Since April of 1942.

Mr. ANDREWS. What was the length of your lease originally?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Five years after the expiration of the war.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, this project has been engineered upon the same premise as previously presented?

Admiral PERRY. An appraisal has been made by a qualified firm of appraisers. Beasely & Beasely, of Washington, D. C., made the appraisal for the property itself and the buildings thereon within the past year at a cost of $2,400.

Mr. OSTERTAG. On that point I would like to inquire: Primarily this item covers the acquisition of land; does it not?

Admiral PERRY. It covers the acquisition of 17.11 acres of land, plus the buildings thereon, which include 3 buildings, the cranes, and miscellaneous machines in the amount of $12,600. The land was appraised at $180,400, making a total for the land and facilities themselves which we have to take of $302,000.

Now the $125,000 item you see in here is the provision in a contract which we had with the owner to pay for the owner's facilities which we would remove.

I think it would be well if Mr. Tiencken, who is our real estate man, would give you additional information on the subject, because he is intimately acquainted with the details.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Thank you; I agree with you. I think it should be clear what this $302,000 covers. You point out that this is more than for the acquisition of land.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Does the Navy own these facilities on this land?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How have you operated heretofore; have you rented?

Mr. TIENCKEN. This is what we term a mixed facility, partly Government owned and partly contractor owned. The land and minor improvements are owned by the contractor; the major part of the improvements are owned by the Government. The contractor had the privilege of buying out the Government's interest or, in lieu of that, the Government buying the contractor's interest. This $302,000 is the appraised value of the contractor's land and his improvements.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that the estimated value?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How have you had the use of these facilities and this land heretofore; have you rented it?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The contractor was the operator during the war and we have had the use of it under a rental agreement since the war and rented it out to a third-party operator.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The appraiser estimates the value of the land at $180,000?

Admiral PERRY. $180,000 for the land.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And $122,000 would be the estimated or appraised value of the facilities on the land; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That the contractor owns.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And with the payment of $302,000, the United States Government or the Navy would then be the sole owner of all these facilities and this land; is that correct?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct, plus $125,000 which was owed to the original contractor.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And we are now appropriating that also?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. One more question and that has to do with the need for condemnation—or is this a matter of appraisal and a mutual arrangement?

Admiral PERRY. There has been no mutual arrangement as yet, Mr. Ostertag. These figures we have given you are our appraisal figures. Whether we can reach a mutual agreement with the owner of this particular parcel of land we cannot say at this moment. We have not been in a position to deal with him. Lack of funds has actually made it impossible to come to terms with him.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would you condemn it?

Admiral PERRY. We would condemn it if we would not reach a mutual agreement; yes, sir.

Mr. Ostertag. Do you feel it is possible to make arrangements within the amounts available as requested?

Admiral PERRY. We feel it is possible; yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And if you are unable to reach an agreement for this land, it would be necessary for you either to condemn it or to come back to Congress for more money; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. If we could not reach what we consider an equitable agreement—and we do consider the amount we have asked for here is equitable—we would throw it into condemnation and let the courts decide. If the courts decided for more money, we would have to come back to you.

NAVAL MINECRAFT BASE, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval Minecraft Base, Charleston, S. C." I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $5,800,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $5,800,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $7,200,000.

I would like to have you make the presentation for this requirement and then I will ask you to supply me with the estimated future appropriation requirement of $7,200,000. I prefer the explanation first for the sum of $5,800,000.

Admiral CLARK. The original small section base was located at Charleston for the purpose of supporting small craft in the harbor and in shore patrol. It was established in 1941. It occupies a little over 18 acres of land, 8 of which are Government-owned; the other 10 being owned by and leased from the city of Charleston.

There is only one permanent building on this base, an administrative headquarters, which is housed in an old rice mill. All of the other buildings are of nonpermanent construction and nearly all of them built during World War II, in 1941 or 1943, and built of low-grade wartime material.

In September 1946, this base was designated as "naval minecraft base." At that time the Mine Force comprised only 15 ships. Now the Mine Force includes 71 ships of various types with a total complement of 230 officers and 3,448 enlisted men, and at times as many as 50 ships are located at the minecraft base.

The deficiencies of the present base fall under a great many categories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us pick up this first one, if you will.

Admiral CLARK. I think I should tell you one thing before we take up the items. We are going to move the base from one place to another and make it bigger. We cannot expand where we are now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the space you have now?

Admiral CLARK. The Department is studying that right now, as to whether we should put in a Reserve training center there, or not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why cannot you take the present space and expand there to accommodate the breakdown indicated in your justifications? What is the reason?

Admiral CLARK. The overwhelming reason is because the helicopters are coming into use for minesweepers. This base is located in down-

town Charleston near to five hospitals. We could not operate helicopters from there. We just must have more space for them.

Secondly, the river there has undermined this land. I mentioned the rice mill. The remaining land is sinking; it floods and if you will look at the small pictures, I think you will agree the first thing we have to do is to move, and I can then tell you why we need each of those facilities at the new place.

[After describing pictures:]

Admiral CLARK. The new site is going to be right adjacent to the Navy yard—in fact a part of it. We own the land and do not have to buy any land. It is good land that does not flood like the other. The present base is right in Charleston and the land is not good and we would have to buy a lot more from the city. We can build cheaper a new facility than we can fix up the present one, and, if we fixed the present one up, it would never be satisfactory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Secretary, what in your opinion would the Navy do with the property it is vacating there, since you have no further use for it?

Mr. FOGLER. My own personal opinion is we would declare it surplus and sell it. That is up for review by the Office of Naval Operations to determine whether or not the property has any further use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What length of time would it take you to move from the site you are leaving and have working abilities on the new site you select?

Admiral CLARK. We hope to build this in increments and I think at the end of 3 years we can move out.

Mr. FOGLER. I think there are two points that have not been brought out plainly enough. Not only does this land flood, but the land itself is falling into the bay. In order to get needed land we would have to fill. This is so because the main street that comes down to this area is over a riverbed through which water is flowing. The question, therefore, is not only whether we can fill, but also whether, even after filling, the soil will not run out from underneath.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Even though that may be a detrimental or possibly unnecessary and expensive item, yet in your justifications I find you are going to have fill and grading and dredging, and I presume use the dredging for fill purposes?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And while you move into a new site, you have the same topography.

Admiral CLARK. That is mostly at the waterfront and actually there is dredging going on at the other site every year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What, offhand, is indicated where you are moving into the [indicated] red site as erosion applies at the present time?

Admiral CLARK. The new site of land is quite suitable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, I presume that white area represents the bay which is subject to advance and recession of the tide; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir, that is not. That used to be an old lighter-than-air station for which we no longer have a mobilization requirement. All that is sand; it was when I was down there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the committee can be assured insofar as continuity of operation of this or the other place is con-

cerned, that you will not move into an area where you are going to have erosion by the movement of the tide swelling, and so forth, as it occurs in that area?

Admiral CLARK. I can assure you we made a very thorough engineering study of this by the public works officer, who took borings, took soundings, took the records of flood, or lack of it, at that particular site.

Mr. FOGLER. Mr. Dallerup was down there, and he possibly might make a statement about that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like at this time to introduce Mr. John Dallerup, who is known to the chairman as the No. 1 Old Man, as I interpret the definition given to this gentleman, and that is a fabrication of a name that did not originate in Congress; it is a name that originated among themselves, so it is nothing offensive when applied to you.

Mr. Dallerup, I welcome you before the committee, because of your many, many years of experience in the field of contractual functions. All too rarely do we have an opportunity to talk to a gentleman of your business experience. So, if you have any comments to add to this matter we are presently inquiring into, I would appreciate your giving them to us.

Mr. DALLERUP. The "Four Old Men" have been to Charleston to the minecraft base on two occasions. Where the old rice mill or administration building stands, it is evident it is on solid ground, on an island, and the surrounding area is filled, wherein the test holes that were drilled have brought up rice hulls.

The record of Charleston shows that the roadway leading into the base is an old river or creek bed. The underwater drainage is settling that land into the river, making a slough. If you were to put a jet piling bulkhead at the river edge, you would create a lake under that base. Practically all of your buildings are sitting on piling and I think the photographs will show where the land is settling from the building. You have had as much as 12 inches of settling and you have had to add a step from the land to the first step level.

To get the needed additional land west of the base toward the bridge, you would have to fill and the bulkhead would have to continue. You would never get rid of the drainage of the underwater.

We know at your new location, which is on much higher ground, the cost of construction and future cost of maintenance at the new location would more than justify the move at this time, because it gives room for expansion and much less cost of construction and meets all of the military questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you and your group who have surveyed the proposition are acquiescing in the proposal of inactivating the present place as fast as you can under the expenditure requirement, and moving into the new one?

Mr. DALLERUP. May I say from our experience in commercial life, we could justify that to any money lender. On the basis of the base they have to set up to meet their needs, I think you will amortize the cost of the new facility through savings in the maintenance costs in a short period of time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you vey much, Mr. Dallerup. Are there any questions?

Mr. OSTERTAG. When was the original site acquired and constructed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean the green?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. It was in 1941, I believe, that we established a small section base where they tied up small inner harbor craft. Then they moved the minecraft base to Charleston and it has been building up rapidly ever since.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would you consider it poor judgment to have located there in the first place?

Admiral CLARK. I think if we could have foreseen the place that mine warfare was to take at the end of the war and which took place, as you remember, in the Korean war, in the rapid advancement of the different types of mines the countries used, it would be poor judgment to go into such a small place. But for a minor operation, where only a small temporary building and small docks were needed to tie up small ships, it was a reasonable thing to do during the war. We also at that time had a requirement for the site we are moving to. We were using it as a lighter-than-air base. But with the rapid advance in mine warfare, the only thing to do is to move and luckily it happened that we are not having to give away any good facilities—anything except the rice mill you have seen the picture of; so we would have had to rebuild somewhere.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I will have to say to you that everything you tell us as to the justification of this request is logical, reasonable, and sound, but it may make some of the things that have happened in the past look rather ridiculous. And when we look at the overall picture of properties of the United States Government, particularly what our Military Establishment has acquired and abandoned, and at the same time acquiring new properties, I am wondering where in the end it is going to leave us. I cannot help but feel that we are in very bad shape so far as the tremendous expenditures of money for facilities and properties is concerned for which we ultimately have no use and finally abandon. At the same time we are in the process of acquiring more land and building more properties.

That is a rather blunt statement; yet that is the situation as it looks to me.

Admiral CLARK. I would like to add in this case we are not taking new land.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not talking about this case; I am talking about the picture generally.

How long ago was this move made which is causing another move and complete abandonment because it was not a sound location in the first place?

Mr. TIENCKEN. I think the one that is mentioned, the section base, was built early in World War II for an antisubmarine base, for the small boats that had to put out from there. So we simply had to utilize what we could there.

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advanced planned by the district public works officer, Sixth Naval District within the past 4 months, utilizing his staff at Government expense.

(After a brief recess to answer a rollcall:)

NAVAL SHIPYARD, MARE ISLAND, VALLEJO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order, and we will proceed with the next item under the title "Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif.," wherein your request is for a total of $4,553,000.

I see reflected in your breakdown the following information, under item 1, "Plant value, land, and construction," $98,570,544; funded construction not in the plant value, $7,885,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $4,553,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,553,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $21,205,000.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will present your requirements under this request, please, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. This consists of two items, the first of which is for the rehabilitation of the ship-repair facilities. Between berths Nos. 3 and 10 submarines are berthed and overhauled.

Two of the berths were originally constructed in 1918, and they have deteriorated to such extent that the wharf has been condemned against the use of heavy cranes and any heavy crane lifts. The fire hazards also are great.

The fire marshall recommended construction of firewalls in case the wharf cannot be replaced. We propose to provide the necessary shop buildings, replace the deteriorated wharf and provide essential battery-charging facilities, a battery shop, and utilities to enable this shipyard to effectively and efficiently accomplish its workload.

For the entire item we are requesting $3,785,000.

Shall I go ahead to the second item, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just a moment, please.

What are you using there now as an office building? I am referring now to item B, which is a two-story reinforced concrete office building on pile foundations.

Admiral CRONIN. They are just improvising for an office building by having the people who will eventually be in the office building farmed out to the main administration building.

That office building is intended to be right in the area of the repair shops so as to most effectively utilize those people who support the labor on the waterfront.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see that you are also going to revise your railroad trackage here. What is the reason for that, please?

Admiral CRONIN. Why are we rerouting the railroad?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am referring to the item having to do with your railroad trackage in which you are making a shift of that.

Admiral CRONIN. We are going to have to replace the wooden wharf there that is so deteriorated that it will not hold the normal flows of traffic, and there has been considerable bypassing of that. I believe that the change in the tracks is part of that, and perhaps the engineering study will show that more clearly. Admiral Perry; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral PERRY. We are putting in a new quay wall, and the railroad trackage will have to be revised and raised up and put on top of this new quay wall.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that also the reason for removing the end of this building?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, that is part of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What does that No. 387 stand for; is that the number of the building?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of building do you have behind there, a cement concrete building, or a wooden structure or what?

Admiral PERRY. It is a masonry structure which was built quite a number of years ago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that your next item, item No. 2, calls for blast cleaning facilities in which you are making a request for $768,000.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are we enlarging the already existing blast cleaning facilities which are there?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. At present we have nothing except an open lot, and the sand sprays all over the yard and actually gets into the machinery. It is also hazardous to the health of the people working there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral, have these Mare Island projects 1 and 2 been engineered to the same degree as those previously considered by the committee?

Admiral PERRY. These projects, Mr. Chairman, were advance planned. John A. Blume, of San Francisco, Calif., advanced planned item 1 within the past 6 months at a cost of $22,960. Item No. 2 was advanced planned by L. S. Rosenar, San Francisco, within the past 9 months at a cost of $5,528.

NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, we will take up the next item, Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.; for which the request is for $308,000, wherein I note at this installation the plant value is $118,101,823; funded construction not in the plant value, $6,628,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $308,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $308,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $12,411,000.

You will proceed to explain the requirements that I have referred to, and then I would like testimony as to the extent of your future appropriations of $12,411,000.

Admiral CLARK. This if for the replacement of a wharf that was constructed in 1925. The entire structure has now deteriorated to the point where it is unsafe for personnel and equipment, being old and rotted and oil-soaked, and it is a fire hazard. It has been condemned to vehicular traffic. This wharf is essential to the docking of vessels in both drydocks 4 and 7 since it is located between and adjacent to their entrances. It is also needed for servicing small ships and barges, but because of its condition it cannot be used for its purposes at the present time. We urgently require the replacement of this during this year.

Admiral Cronin, you might mention some of the large items of future appropriations required for this yard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, if you will upon the same premise that you referred to those others previously.

Admiral CRONIN. If it is agreeable, Mr. Chairman, I will just list the major ones.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, that will be enough.

Admiral CRONIN. The largest single project we have there is increasing the facilities required for Forrestall class carriers and other major vessels at drydocks Nos. 3, 4 and 8 and berthing areas, $2,900,000.

The next item is reinforce quay wall, Berths 1 and 2, $2,161,000.

Next is an additional crane and services for Berths 11 and 12, $1,676,000.

The next item is a new mess hall and galleys and garbage disposal facilities in all of the barracks, $1,250,000.

Also a new turbine and boiler in the boiler and power plant, $1,052,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you figure that these projected or future appropriations will be necessary?

Admiral CRONIN. We have 3 items which are planned for 1957; and about 8 items which are planned for 1958, that is, in the essential category; and about 15 or 16 items which are planned for the following year, 1959; and the remaining items are for long-range planning, construction dependent on what develops between now and that time. We, of course, might change those priorities around.

Admiral PERRY. The item in this years request has been advanced planned within the past 6 months by Myron, Sturgeon, Engineers, Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $3,000.

NANY UNDERWATER SOUND LABORATORY, FORT TRUMBULL, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, let us take up the next item, Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn., for which you are asking $66,600.

Admiral CLARK. This is for family housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see that you are reflecting plant value of $6,208,639; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $66,600; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $66,600; and the estimated future appropriation required, $432,000.

Explain the requirements that you have here for the $66,600 first, please, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This amount is for 5 sets of family housing, 1 for the junior officers and 4 for the enlisted men. This is to provide urgently required key personnel quarters for people who must live aboard in order to provide surveillance of very valuable Government property without working undue hardship on the individuals. Expensive equipment for testing infrared equipment, submarine communication systems and for development of integrated communication systems is permanently installed on the island and must be guarded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, how accurate is your estimated cost on a unit basis as reflected here for your junior officers, company grade and for enlisted men? I note here the cost is reflected as $15,200 per unit for the junior officers and that the cost for the enlisted men is $12,850 per unit.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, let me here state that in the case of all of these items that you will find for family housing—or the majority

of them—that they have not been advanced planned and fall within the category of the exceptions which I mentioned this morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral PERRY. The figures which you see before you are the limitations set upon the particular type of quarters that we will construct for the officers or the enlisted men, as the case may be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I am interested in your whole housing program, but I am specifically interested in this particular phase of it. While your figures, as presented, are not revealing of detail to the degree which you undoubtedly would like to have them be, what percentage of deviation from your experience to date in housing category of this type might be effected by a 10-percent differential or a 5-percent differential?

Admiral PERRY. As compared with what date?

Mr. SHEPPARD. With any date as of this fiscal year.

Admiral PERRY. The only answer I could give you on any of these quarters' estimates in here, Mr. Chairman, is that we feel we can design a house having a square footage such as mentioned here which will come within the figures we have given here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, naturally, a house built up in New London, Conn., should cost more than a house built out near San Bernardino; is not that right?

Admiral PERRY. Because you do not have the same condition as regards weather down in San Bernardino as you have up in New London.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do these figures represent the cost inclusive of the architect and design engineer's costs per unit?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; they do. These are budget estimates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This may be asking you a hypothetical question that is a little bit difficult, but I am wondering if you can tell me at a cost of $15,200 per unit what percentage of that total would go to the architect and design engineers?

Admiral PERRY. Not over 5 percent, Mr. Chairman. That would be the maximum and, of course, you must bear in mind that if you had a number of these quarters then the percentage would go down greatly for the overall project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that is true. Now is it the concept of the Navy in housing of the type we are presently discussing to have a uniform type of building?

Admiral CLARK. To some extent; yes, sir. The Secretary of Defense is coordinating the housing requests and if you get a chance to see the Army or Air Force testimony you will find they are to use the same figures for each grade as the Navy does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us address ourselves to the Navy at the present time, because that is the only thing we are reviewing at the moment.

Mr. Dallerup, I would like to ask this question, if I may. This has plagued me for quite some time. If we go into a standard type of house for junior officers and for enlisted men and we have design engineers draw the type of property we will want and the specifications for construction purposes, why would it be necessary to have a design on each project as long as we were operating in the same sphere of climatic conditions? In other words, why could not we take the original engineering technique and apply that to the next

base within the same climatic conditions as the first one, instead of having the technique repeated?

Mr. DALLERUP. You can, but I do not think you can set a criterion or plan the overall requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not, either, because of the shifting climatic conditions.

Mr. DALLERUP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to establish and make a little more plain is hypothetically for a military base the blueprints and the engineering techniques are all set for a grouping of 4 or 5 hundred houses for junior officers and enlisted men in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DALLERUP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now within a circumference of 350 to 500 miles the climatic conditions are practically the same, are they not?

Mr. DALLERUP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why would not the blueprints and specifications be applicable to the other projects for the same type of job as they will be over here? You tell me why they would not be.

Mr. DALLERUP. Site adaptation. The floor plans could be the same.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course I will admit that the site, to wit, the property upon which the houses would have to go, would vary in cost, and so forth; but I am addressing myself now purely to the design engineering of the house itself, irrespective of where you put it, within the same climatic conditions.

Mr. DALLERUP. You can do it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you recommend that policy of procedure be followed?

Mr. DALLERUP. Yes, sir; I would.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What objection, Admiral Perry, if any, would emanate from your Division to following a practice of that character which would eliminate at least—not perhaps at once—a lot of engineering research, and so forth, of having special plans drawn for each project wherever it may be within the same climatic area?

Admiral PERRY. I will let Mr. Dallerup testify as regards the floor planning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is what I am talking about.

Admiral PERRY. We could use the same floor plans over and over and it need not necessarily be only 350 miles from where we are. I am speaking now of the floor plans. You mentioned Washington. I can go 130 miles from Washington and I would say to you "No; I could not build the same looking structure"—shall I put it that way—"or have the same exterior treatment to the house you would have in Washington."

Let us take the Army post here at Fort McNair. You have a certain type of architecture that, if you build houses there, you would naturally try to conform to the existing architecture. If you went to Williamsburg, you would have to give a different treatment. There are many of those cases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, as I interpret your statement, then, the added cost of engineering in each one of these projects is not predicated upon the stability of the house or its comfortable appeal for those who are using it, but would be due to the fact of conforming with the architecture in that particular place?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

I might mention at this point that we do have standards. Whether those standards will fit every particular case, I cannot say. But we try to have them fit as many cases in as many places as we can. And it must be understood that when the architect-engineer uses standard designs, the fee is reduced accordingly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well the whole thing hinges upon this aspect, as I interpret your answer and my idea of it—I mean by that your response—that is, that the actual engineering technique at project A versus project B, geographically speaking, is necessary for conformation with the other architecture on the base?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then to the degree of uniformity of appearance, uniformity of housing, we have to look at that rather askance, have we not?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was your comment, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. FOGLER. We standardize barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you are going to standardize some barracks, then you do not conform with the architecture of X base and what would be the difference of having housing that did not conform to the geography or architecture of X base?

Mr. FOGLER. I think it is a very significant factor in our housing development and I personally think we can do a great deal more of standardization than has been done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The thing that impressed me so definitely in the cost factor was the fact that we have had in my own State a considerable amount of housing projects wherein, in the original housing plans and specifications, the military themselves have said, "This is splendid; we like it; we will buy it." We immediately move just exactly 75 miles from that location and spend $85,000 for a new architect when we already owned plans that were acceptable at the other place, and that did not quite meet with what I think was a good expenditure. So, if I am wrong in my thinking, I ask you gentlemen to put me on the right track.

Admiral PERRY. I think your thinking is absolutely right, Mr. Chairman. I for one subscribe to the use of the same plans over and over if the same plan will suit the local conditions. I am sure you are very familiar with the various Wherry bill housing projects throughout California. They have one type of architecture, for instance, at Monterey and a different type of architecture at Port Hueneme.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And a different one at San Diego.

Admiral PERRY. I will just use those two for comparison. For instance, the initial project at Monterey, if I recall correctly, was 500 units and 300 units were added later.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Correct.

Admiral PERRY. You had a certain amount of land; you could expand. But at Port Hueneme, you had a development where you had to house some 324 people. In the first instance, I think you will find most of the houses are one-story affairs. At Port Hueneme, you had to go to two-story structures in order to get the number of units that the available property would accommodate. So the Monterey plan could not have been adapted to the Port Hueneme situation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is obvious. It would be a rather difficult thing to make a plan for one story fit the accommodations for a two-story operation. But, again, that does not obviate the fact you are still in a one-story operation at San Diego, San Pedro, and what not. My inquiry is where the one is compatible with the other.

Admiral PERRY. They could be used over and over and any time we do not do it then I say we are not using good engineering practice.

I must also add this comment at this point. The field sometimes likes to override what you propose to put at any individual site. As a consequence, you propose, let us say, to use the Monterey plan at San Diego and they say, "We do not like that." What are you going to do about it?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the point I would like to have resolved now. In fact, there must be some place along the line, somebody out of this group of gentlemen in executive positions who has the right and authority to say whether they shall or shall not. I am trying to establish whether or not the authority is here and we have it—and I think we do under the law—and it is being applied. Because in this total appropriation bill, particularly as it applies to housing in California, it is plain it is going to cost a lot of dollars. I think you will agree to that as compared to the need being supplied. I agree heretofore we have had difficulty with the field interests; they have not liked the approach of the north to the south houses, even though the allotment for them called for the same type houses. I have been exposed to several of them.

Now the question resolves itself down to who is going to say to the people in the field "I am sorry; this money is going to be expended for these houses period."

Mr. FOGLER. I think as Secretary I have the authority at the present time. I did not have it a year ago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have it, from my exposure to your operations, I am inclined to believe you will see it becomes operative and not just one of the hypothetical concepts.

Mr. FOGLER. I will try to.

NAVY MINE COUNTERMEASURES STATION, PANAMA CITY, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Navy Mine Countermeasures Station, Panama City, Fla., where I find your request is for $3,379,000.

Here I find the plant value is $3,121,740; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,150,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,379,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,379,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $6,012,000.

You will proceed to make your presentation of requirements; then we will inquire into the future appropriations on the same premise we have those in the past.

Admiral CLARK. The Navy Mine Countermeasures Station at Panama City is expanding very rapidly in accordance with the urgent emphasis being placed on the mission, which is to develop adequate countermeasures against known new types of torpedos and mines. This is one of the top priority programs the Navy has and is carried on almost exclusively at Panama City. However, progress is very badly handicapped by lack of facilities; inadequate waterfront facili-

ties, laboratory, and administrative offices and facilities for helicopter operations, training, and recreation.

Since the station was originally planned and used as a small amphibious training station, there is not only lack of space and facilities, but those which do exist are old and unsuitable in location, size and type for efficient and economical operation as a countermeasures station. The activity at most is uneconomical. A study has been going on for over 2 years and we now have a plan which we consider to be the most feasible solution for expansion and conversion; at the same time we will make utilization of what we have already to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have reflected under "d" a 3-story masonry building to cost $320,000. What is that for and to what purpose are you going to apply it?

Admiral CLARK. This is for an administration building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us take up item 2, "Land acquisition." What is that for?

Admiral CLARK. This is for the purchase of 3 parcels of land totaling 132 acres. Part of the land is now owned by the city and leased. On it have been constructed a warehouse, explosive magazines, roadways, waterfronts, and other facilities, the value of which today is estimated to be $200,000. We cannot go ahead with our planned expansion without possession of this land, which we must acquire to protect the Government's interests in the present improvements. We must provide an area for the expanded workload and provide protection against physical interference which would result.

Land values are increasing so rapidly, we urgently need authority to acquire the land as soon as possible.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral, I have before me a communication from Hon. Robert E. Sikes, a member of the Appropriations Committee, addressed to me as chairman, which has to do with what he says is 350 acres of land of Bay County ownership and F. E. Hinman's tracts 1 and 8.

I wish you would take that letter down to the Department and give me the proper answer, so that the answer can be placed in the record at this point.

Admiral CLARK. I will be glad to do that.

(The following was supplied later:)

The inquiry of Congressman Sikes regarding the acquisition of land at Panama City refers to approximately 350 acres of land being utilized for the Naval Mine Countermeasures Station, Panama City, Fla. Congressman Sikes refers to parcels 1 and 8 as presently being valued at approximately $147,000 and indicates that waterfront property is worth at least $400 per acre.

A review of this property shows that in September 1942 the Navy had filed condemnation proceedings for approximately 350 acres of land under the Second War Powers Act. This was followed in December by a declaration of taking correcting the acreage to 368.61 and depositing $23,168.95 as the fair value for this taking. A judgment covering parcel 5, containing 119.1 acres, owned by F. M. Hyndman et al, was rendered in favor of the United States on April 7, 1945, fixing just compensation in the sum of $20,041.45. Parcels 2, 3, and 6, containing 117.6 acres, were also acquired at $2,125.

The owners of tracts 1, 4, and 8 requested that the property comprising these tracts not be taken in fee but by lease. Subsequently, a judgment was filed August 29, 1946, granting the United States the right to use and occupy for so long as the Navy shall desire these 3 tracts and fixing compensation at $73.40 per annum. These 3 tracts comprise 132.1 acres and are the tracts presently proposed for

acquisition by the Navy. The Navy's estimate of $52,000, which was the amount for which funds are requested, is approximately $392 per acre and compares favorably with the $400 per acre indicated by Congressman Sikes.

The figure of $147,000 mentioned in Congressman Sikes' letter would be the value of 368 acres at $400 per acre. It appears from the above that the Navy's request for funds is predicated upon paying the owners a fair price for the actual property to be acquired at this time; namely, 132.1 acres rather than 368 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we will pick up item 3, "Training, recreation, and Navy exchange center" wherein you are asking for $455,000. Please present your requirements for this expenditure request.

Admiral CLARK. This station is an isolated one, 7 miles away from Panama City, Fla. In addition to the 225 people on the base, there is an additional military population of about 450 attached to the ships that operate from the base. Recreation facilities, therefore, are urgently required for a total of 700 people.

Our present facilities consist of one building and a combination movie-recreation. We also have 2 tennis courts and 1 soft-ball diamond.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also a snack bar, Navy exchange store, barbershop, and so forth; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up item 4, "Helicopter facility," for which the request is $372,000. Present your justifications for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. The use of helicopters in connection with minesweepers is now in effect, and we want to expand it. At present we have one helicopter operating from the baseball field. This operation is hazardous, it being a limited area, and there is no immediate use made of it. We plan to have seven helicopters as soon as we can provide the facilities.

We have a request for $372,000, which includes site preparation; hangar, including shops; concrete paving; utilities and collateral.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is part of the minesweeper program?

Admiral CLARK. This is an extremely important part of the mine-warfare program. We will use it for other purposes which I can tell you of off the record, if you wish.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next is item 5, "Land acquisition and construction of magazines," where you are asking for $417,000. What is the explanation, please?

Admiral CLARK. Item 5 is to acquire 333.4 acres of land for the storage of high-explosive material. Since the base was originally built as an amphibious training station, we had only small arms magazines, nine. It is unsuitable for the storage of high explosives because of their location in the heart of the industrial area. We plan to save trucking through the industrial area by relocation and the building of the number of magazines required by this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the buildings presently on the site?

Admiral CLARK. Some of them will be moved; some will continue to be used for small arms and inert materials.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do have a use for that number, even though you are going into this expansion program?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Item No. 6 is "Land acquisition and erection of observation towers," where you are asking for $76,000. Tell us what that is needed for?

Admiral CLARK. This is a small amount of land acquisition for the erection of observation towers necessary when essential operations are carried out at this station, which requires very precise tracking of the ships as they sweep or engage in exercises off the base. This requires observation towers at three points to house instruments on rigid foundations. They are presently subjected to sand, moisture, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Item No. 7 is "Bulkhead and concrete work area," where you are requesting $690,000. Give us the explanation for that, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the development of adequate berthing space and work area for servicing minecraft and other craft engaging in the station's work. The total value of minesweeping and countermeasures gear that this program supports is valued at $30 million. An additional $28 million is being procured during 1955 and we plan to procure still $30 million more in 1956.

Last year Congress authorized waterfront improvements by providing a new bulkhead. This appropriation is the second increment in the improvement of the waterfront area and for replacement of the old dock, a new bulkhead and to improve the work area. It will provide a bulkhead length of 2,590 linear feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As indicated in your justifications, this will take care of berthing for 1,900 vessels and small craft totaling 2,900?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; those are feet; that is the number of feet of berthing space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the old dock you are going to abolish? Are you going to tear it down and eliminate what you have there, or what?

Admiral PERRY. We are taking down the existing timber wharf. We figure it will cost about $18,000.

Admiral CRONIN. This is in the same place, actually.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are taking it down and replacing it with a new one?

Admiral PERRY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Item No. 8 is for "Laboratory building," where you are asking for $960,000. Give us the explanation, please?

Admiral CLARK. The initial increment was authorized by Congress last year. It involves the continued use of two small old buildings with laboratory space, so that we would have a split operation. Also further detailed studies show additional shop requirements would require a new shop building. They are expensive and a thorough engineering study was made of the complete layout and it was decided it would be more economical and efficient to consolidate all the laboratory space in 1 building and to release the 2 old buildings now being used for laboratory space for small shops.

Mr. SHEPARD. Admiral Perry, have these projects comprising a, total of $3,379,000 for naval mine countermeasures at Panama City, Fla., been engineered to the same degree, or proportionately thereof as the other projects we have had under consideration?

Admiral PERRY. All of the items included under this particular project with the exception of item 6 have been advance planned by

the Radar Engineering Co., of Miami, Fla., within the past 9 months at a cost of $28,304. The advance planning for item 6 was done by the district public works officer of the 6th Naval District at Charleston, S. C. with his forces at Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate any difficulty in your land acquisition in any of these items?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Which ones do you have reference to directly in answer to my question from item 1 on up?

Admiral PERRY. Are you referring only to Panama City?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is all I am referring to—Panama City.

Admiral PERRY. I cannot say we will have any particular problem there. On the other hand, however, you have received a communication from Congressman Sikes which would indicate to me that there may be an argument in the offing before we obtain the lands in question.

Admiral CLARK. It is a resort area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am sure you will find Mr. Sikes rather amenable to the actual conditions. I have always found him that way. Perhaps when we get the response back, it will clarify the situation.

Are there any questions upon the part of any member of the committee? If not, the committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1955.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order. We will take up the next item which is reflected in the requirements of Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa., wherein you are making a request for an appropriation to the extent of $321,300.

I note at this installation the plant value is $147,574,535; funded construction not in the plant value, $6,060,000; existing unfunded authorization, $321,300; the proposed 1956 authorization, none; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $321,300; and the estimated future appropriation required, $43,628,000.

Admiral, will you project your justifications for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, we are requesting 25 units of family housing which are urgently required by the shipyard for key enlisted personnel of the shipyard and the naval activities in the vicinity. There is no enlisted family housing at the shipyard or at the adjacent naval activities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that your unit cost is comparable to those that you have revealed previously.

Admiral PERRY. As I explained yesterday, Mr. Chairman, these unit costs that we have used are costs which were given to us by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). There has been no advance planning, for any of these family housing items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And these would include, I presume, the same as the others, a possible variable of from 5 to 10 percent?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H.

The next item reflected here is naval shipyard at Portsmouth, N. H. which reveals a request for electric power cable, replacing dewatering pumps, and so forth, for which you are asking a total of $946,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $34,442,326; funded construction not in the plant value, $3,346,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $946,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $946,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $9,895,000.

Will you present your justifications for this requirement, please, Admiral?

Admiral Clark. This consists of two items, Mr. Chairman. The first item is for electric power cable. The present generating capacity of the shipyard is 7,400 kilowatts, which is derived from 2 generators.

In addition, the yard purchases additional electric power from the local utility company.

There is at the present time a power demand for more than we have and in addition there is a large anticipated increase in capacity over the next few years, and it is expected that this load will exceed within 3 years 13,000 kilowatts.

Mr. Sheppard. Does that requirement pertain to both the submarine cable as presented in your justification and the underground cable as well?

Admiral Clark. This is the total deficiency and the local utility company has agreed to sell the yard additional power. If we can get this cable, this will be the most economical way to meet our requirements. We have to run the cable from the power source on an island in the river over to the station.

Mr. Sheppard. That would obviously be your submarine cable.

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Now, what is the reference to the underground cable? That is a continuity of the same cable but it is carried underground?

Admiral Perry. It runs across the river there.

Mr. Sheppard. Yes. In other words, you are connecting into a unit that is a submarine cable, and then you are going on with that?

Admiral Perry. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. What are you referring to as switchgear? I thought I was familiar with the phraseology of the Navy, but this is the first time I have ever encountered that. What is it?

Admiral Perry. In order to tie into the power company's transformer units we have to have a switching gear at that point so that we can connect our cables into the powerline. This project was advance planned by the staff of the district public works officer at Government expense.

Mr. Sheppard. In item 2 you are asking for $791,000, and this consists of a series of requirements. Will you indicate the necessity for the request, please?

Admiral Clark. This is the second and last item for this station. It is a project for the replacement of dewatering pumps for drydock No. 2. The existing pumps were installed in 1903, and maintenance is now so difficult, and replacement parts cannot be obtained, so that

we are actually endangering the ability to get water out of the docks, when a ship has to be worked on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The demolition aspect is only a small sum, but what do you want to do with that money?

Admiral PERRY. That is to get rid of the old dewatering pumps and put in the new foundations for the new pumps. The old pumps that are there now are of 40,000-gallon capacity. The new pumps will be of 60,000-gallon capacity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The entire requirement is delineated in the various subheads here which go into the various requirements for the replacement of your dewatering pumps and the whole operation as such?

Admiral PERRY. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning was accomplished by Alonzo B. Reed, Boston, at a cost of $4,500.

NAVY ELECTRONICS LABORATORY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

All right, we will proceed with the next item, "Naval Electronics Laboratory at San Diego, Calif.," where you are asking for $143,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $10,379,239; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $143,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $143,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,574,000.

Will you make your presentation for this requirement, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; this project is for the acquisition of 13 parcels of land containing a total of 398 acres. This land surrounds the laboratory field station. It is not right at Point Loma, but this laboratory field station is near the Mexican border, about 18 miles south of San Diego. This station was specifically selected as being free of electronic interference.

If we can get the surrounding parcels of land, which, as you see, are not very expensive, we would prevent any industry from bringing in any machines that will cause interference with our electronic experiments which we are doing in connection with ships.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The laboratory itself would take how many acres for protective purposes?

Admiral CLARK. Actually at this substation where we have 64 acres of leased land we want to buy that land and a total of about 330 more acres surrounding it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You presently own 532.4 acres there? That is correct, is it not?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; that is at the main station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, I see.

Admiral CLARK. At this field station we just have leased 64 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the difference between 64 acres and 398 is what you want for protective purposes?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the price of this land, or the estimated cost per acre?

Admiral PERRY. $359.30 per acre, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering aspect of this situation, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. So far as the unit cost of the land is concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have an appraisal of the land by Mr. Bruce Stallard, of San Diego, Calif., who is a registered appraiser in San Diego. We feel that his figures are as accurate as can be. The appraisal was obtained for $1,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you figure that this additional land will amply protect your sensitive electronic devices against any interference by people moving in adjacent thereto?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are not coming back in a year from now to tell me that you have made a mistake, that somebody is jamming up your works?

Admiral CLARK. No, I think not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, let us know; let us find out.

Admiral CLARK. A survey has been made of this area, has it not?

Admiral CRONIN. Yes, sir; unless our requirements change to an extent greater than we can possibly visualize now, this will be a satisfactory amount of area for the future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anything projected in your operational plans here indicating that a change might be made?

Admiral CRONIN. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item, Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag, do you have any questions on this item?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think not, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL REPAIR FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will proceed with the next item, "Naval repair facility, San Diego, Calif.," replace and relocate steam lines, for which you are requesting $629,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $67,740,000; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $629,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $629,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,768,000.

Will you make your presentation for this requirement, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. This item is for the replacement of 10,500 linear feet of existing steam and condensate lines in a new underground concrete trench to provide reliable services and ready access for maintenance purposes. The present steam and condensate lines consist of used steel pipe which was installed during World War II. They are imbedded in raw earth and are not protected against rust or corrosion. The deterioration has been so rapid that now the annual maintenance cost is about 17 percent of the original cost. Frequent interruptions of steam service due to the requirement for digging up and replacing sections of the old pipe have made it urgent that we replace this pipe.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in order to conduct operations on the base under the normal working requirements, this replacement of a faulty pipe and sundry attributes that contribute to the total delivery of the requirements for steam has to be done, and this is your proposal to take care of the situation?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status engineeringwise of this project, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by J. B. Gill & Co., of Long Beach, Calif., at a cost of $4,500 and I have no doubt that the estimates shown here are the best that could be produced.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions, Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I have no questions.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will take up the next item, "Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.," wherein you are making a rather heavy request for $4,369,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $80,000,701; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,098,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $4,369,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,369,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $41,570,000.

Will you make your presentation on the requirements for these funds, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. The first item, for the shipyard, San Francisco, sir, is to construct a concrete and steel quay wall to replace one that was constructed of untreated timber and piling. We actually cannot use this area to its fullest extent right now, and we are requesting $1,588,000 to demolish the existing quay wall and to install a new one with the necessary railroad tracking and utilities, and to accomplish the necessary paving in the vicinity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the paving, blacktop?

Admiral PERRY. It will be 3-inch asphaltic concrete. This project was advance planned by John A. Blume, San Francisco, at a cost of $22,482.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. The second one is an addition to the steam test plant, an addition to a building that is on pile foundations, and equipment, including cranes, high test boiler, condensors, water-treatment equipment, high-pressure piping, low-pressure piping and pumps, including installation.

This item provides for the installation of a steam high temperature and pressure testing facility wherein we can test modern main propulsion and auxiliary equipment instead of sending it up to Mare Island and then bring it back again.

The estimated annual saving from this item is $325,000 a year, and we anticipate that it will amortize itself at the end of 3½ years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what is the necessity for water treatment in that area?

Admiral CLARK. This is for boilers. This has to be very pure water.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are trying to cut down the salinity of the water?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, the salinity and the alkalinity.

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning was accomplished by Myron C. Gould, San Francisco, for $6,600.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Take up the next item, "Land acquisition," wherein you are asking for $1,834,000.

Present your justifications for this requirement, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is a large item.

As you will note, it is for $1,600,000. It is to permit us to continue the orderly development of this very important shipyard, and we have asked the Chief of the Bureau of Ships to bring the management engineer of this area here and, sir, he has a picture that he would like to show you if you have just a minute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to have a picture of all of the lands you are going to have to refill, and a picture of what you are going to put onto them in the way of buildings, and so forth.

Admiral CLARK. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will introduce Mr. R. I. Palmer, management engineer from the San Francisco naval shipyard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Palmer, you will proceed with your statement, please.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, at the present time the San Francisco naval shipyard consists of the area you see plotted before you, consisting of approximately 637 acres.

Basically this is the problem as it exists today, of acquiring tideland here [indicating] the colored line being the property ownership line [indicating on map].

Now the project that we are speaking of is to acquire the land which you see on this very low part of this which extends the shipyard to the boundaries shown here [indicating].

Now, this amounts to approximately 354 acres, and has an advance engineering and architect-engineering study on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the first item which consists of 80.89 acres and indicate it on the map.

Mr. PALMER. The first area, area A, is this particular section here [indicating on map].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see.

Mr. PALMER. Area A is here [indicating], and area B is the area out here [indicating]. You will see that here we have piers.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all water, is it not?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; but you see there is a pier built here with ships anchored on it.

This land [indicating] is being utilized by the Navy at the present time without benefit of lease or ownership. It is owned by the State of California.

Area C is the area included in this red here [indicating].

Area D is a little section of 1⅛ acres right here [indicating].

Area E is part of the hill here. This is a large hill, coming out here on a long promintory, known as Hunter's Point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. And area F is on top of the hill [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before you leave that hill situation, are you going to level that hill down in order to get fill material?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; we are taking about 1 million cubic yards out of there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And how far under the surface do you hit hard rock?

Mr. PALMER. Based upon our experience we do not anticipate any difficulty, as our past excavations show the hill to consist largely of decomposed serpentine rock which can be readily moved with modern earth-moving equipment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. There are buildings on there, are there not?

Mr. PALMER. No. You see, this hill is cleared off.

Mr. OSTERTAG. All the area within the red line, the borderline, is a matter of land acquisition, is it not?

Mr. PALMER. Anything outside of the red and orange crosshatched line, which is the shipyard's current property line, is the land acquisition.

The problem that we are confronted with is indicated by this very well.

This shows two things. First it shows why we require it now, and second, why the additional areas that we will have to have in mobilization are based upon currently assigned missions.

The Chairman may be familiar with the freeways which are being built in San Francisco.

When a six-lane divided highway is in here, it will effectively control any further extension in this general direction [indicating].

We must also at this time, in cooperation with the city and county planning commission and the State planning commission, determine where the accesses to this shipyard are going to be so that the necessary cloverleafs and other things can be determined as to location in constructing this freeway. This, then, will determine our future boundary.

Second, where you see this green line coming out here [indicating], and out here [indicating], this indicates the private filling operations which are going on by trash fill at the present time in this general area, basically rubbish that is thrown out here, and as it fills up they move on out to another area. Here is the way the area was about 6 months ago [indication], and it has now progressed out to here [indicating].

We have a firm requirement for these areas. They are now being developed by private interests with unsatisfactory fill and buildings will be put up later. But, I think as soon as we find the eventual requirement for them, then the problem before the committee will be to buy the whole area with improvements thereon.

Now, the third point here is the actual current needs, why we have to have this land.

The red projects which you see here are the current projects which are our current requirements.

Admiral Cronin may want to comment more about this, but basically we have to provide a military personnel center and shipyard based upon the ships that will be assigned to the Yard, to provide logistic support to about 20,000 naval personnel. At the present time we have about 5,000, but it varies with the number of ships that there are on the waterfront.

Those requirements are seven barracks buildings, a subsistence building, a recreation building and play area, a chapel, a military personnel administration building, and a medical-dental building that we require in this area here [indicating].

The three little buildings which you see there, the neutron-electron-gamma radiation facilities, cannot be built on that hill site, or should not be built until the earth that we referred to earlier has been taken from here [indicating] and put over into here [indicating]. If we fill

behind this hill, we in effect bury about $700,000 worth of fill. It has no value unless it is moved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are going to bring that hill down to the level of your other formation within the area?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Apparently you are going to have to fill most of the acreage. This material which is not recognized engineeringwise as a very good base will more than absorb your fill capacity?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are you going to derive your fill for your extension into the water on the right side of your map?

Mr. PALMER. Here [indicating]. Basically this area [indicating] will have to be filled out to here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wonder if you would indicate on the map the hill or hills that you will level off, and to what particular projects you will apply the amount of rock, dirt, and so forth, emanating from the hills in the leveling-off process.

Mr. PALMER. That gets into technical detail.

If we take the sand over here [indicating] from here, then they will probably use this hill as a cover over the sand to hold the sand down. Now, if that proves unfeasible, then this [indicating] will be taken over here and dumped immediately into the water across the road here [indicating], and the fill will be brought from this area here [indicating] into that area [indicating].

In that connection, the Chairman may be familiar with the fact that in our State the legislature has just passed a reclamation bill providing for the reclamation of 508 acres in this area here [indicating]. This bill is now before the governor for his signature. I checked on it and there appears to be no question that this will be signed. Basically, they are proposing to take the earth from here [indicating], and fill it into this area out to the San Francisco County line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. About where would that become immediately adjacent to the borderline of the expansion program you are now presenting?

Mr. PALMER. At this point here [indicating].

Mr. OSTERTAG. You mean outside the red line?

Mr. PALMER. Actually there is an area of conflict here, which is 22 blocks; 11 blocks long and 2 blocks wide. We checked with the reclamation district and there is no problem in there, but it simply highlights the essential nature of acquiring this property now before it is developed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who did you say owned that 22 blocks of property in there?

Mr. PALMER. There is a big strip of it owned by the State of California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you entered into negotiations with the State of California to the extent that you do not contemplate any trouble in getting that land?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir; and we have also had a meeting with the property owners in this area which will be filled up. There are 101 property owners in this area here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of properties are they, residential?

Mr. PALMER. No; this is largely light industry and heavy industry, and residential up on the hill.

That raises another question. The zoning and development of this yard is being controlled, inso far as practical with its assigned mission, to permit of the community development behind us, so the residential area in this fill area here ties in with the residential area of the city and county planning development. They are developing their permanent housing in this reach of it [indicating], and the heavy industry here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is that protrusion outside of your land just above the letter D which sticks out on the surface? From my point of view it looks like it is protruding out from the normal line that would be drawn in here.

Mr. PALMER. This tunnels in here and comes out here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. But why do you need that projecting piece of land which throws your alinement out of conformity?

Mr. PALMER. The area here is required for a naval personnel housing development here, for development and expansion of the United States Radiological Defense Laboratory, for the expansion of the shipyard and the rail marshaling yard.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that all new planning?

Mr. PALMER. You see these black lines here [indicating]?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. There is the shipyard marshaling land, and the turning occurs in this little section here [indicating]. Any long-range plan calls for this to be moved, in order that the Radiological Defense Laboratory can take over here for the testing and calibration of radioactive instruments. The only way that space can be obtained here is to move into this area [indicating]. You see, there are permanent improvements here and here that do not permit it to move in this area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the occupancy of that projecting piece out there?

Mr. PALMER. It is unoccupied. This whole area [indicating] is owned by the Federal Housing Authority. They have agreed to its transfer to the Navy, I understand, without exchange of funds subject to the question of the legality of it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, there is nothing on it today?

Mr. PALMER. No, sir; except there is World War II temporary housing there which is due for demolition, which has to be done by December of this year, unless someone states a need for it. This ties in with the long-range housing requirements of the shipyard. These are houses which are of the one type which must be moved from this area as this industrial area expands, so these houses which are now here and the personnel who live here in 374 apartments will be moved from here to permanent housing back in the residential area as soon as possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But not in the same type of structures?

Mr. PALMER. No, sir; those were built for World War II temporary use and have outlived their economic use actually.

We talked about our instrument testing range that goes in here. We have to have an engineering building for radiological work that goes in here. We have to have three supply buildings for storage. We have to have a scrap salvage yard which moves down into this white area, which is open space.

We have to relocate the shipyard railroad marshaling yard, and certainly we want to acquire this piece of land that we are using in

area B, as we have $1,300,000 worth of improvements in an area that will cost less than one-third of a million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is water, is it not?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir; that is water.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That means you are going to have to fill in?

Mr. PALMER. The filling would come on the line here [indicating].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that deep water?

Mr. PALMER. No, sir; this runs 15 to 20 feet along in this area. This is the shallow side of the bay. This is very deep out here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that inundated at high tide?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir; it is completely covered at high tide and low tide. The only point that is now exposed at low tide is this area [indicating].

Now, the mobilization requirements are shown in this block. We have to provide additional barracks and recreational area for these 20,000 people in here and additional storage space and additional drydocks and piers. These are required to meet the assigned mobilization mission of the shipyard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of that total is in the present requirement as against that which is projected over a period of time?

Mr. PALMER. At the present time the projects are broken down into three categories, as Admiral Clark explained.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Admiral CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, would you like to have me read off the typical large items, as I did in connection with the previous projects?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not particularly necessary, but I would like to know if you can give me an analysis of it, approximately what is considered out of the total requirement of $1,834,000, will be projected into next year, if you can.

Admiral CRONIN. We have associated with that particular problem plans for next year an urgent project for $13,170,000 for land excavation and fill. That is following up this particular project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. That, of course, has not been approved by the Navy Department yet. Whether it will be approved in that amount or not, next year, we cannot say yet. We will review that requirement of the Bureau of Ships when they come before us. This is the Bureau of Ships plan, and it is thought we would have to include an increment of that. Whether we can perform at that level will remain to be seen.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are doing in this request is asking for $1,834,000 for land acquisition plus fill?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct, insofar as basic land acquisition is concerned. We are seeking to obtain the land necessary now to meet both our current and known mobilization requirements. However, the amount of fill involved in this project is not substantial when compared to the total of the program which will be submitted next year or in future years for development of the tidelands proposed herein to be acquired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the policy point of view I can only construe that those who are in the policy field have no reluctance about the future development of the land, or they would not permit the land to appear at this time in here for appropriation purposes, and they want to prepare the land for structural projects later on.

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir, it is quite firm. We will come back for another increment next year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will you yield at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I have no further questions.

Mr. OSTERTAG. As I understand it, according to your justifications, your present plant is valued at approximately $80 million.

Mr. PALMER. No, that is the acquisition cost. The present value of the plant is approximately $200 million replacement cost.

Admiral CLARK. That column, Mr. Ostertag, is the cost you see.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What does the $80 million represent?

Mr. PALMER. That is the cost when acquired. It is not the replacement value of the plant. To duplicate the land and buildings it would cost $200 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. On the basis of valuation?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Actually it represents an investment of $80 million as of the 1st of January 1954?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Your current budget request amounts to $4,369,000?

Admiral CLARK. That is the total request for this shipyard. For this particular land acquisition which has been described it is $1,600,000.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The $1,600,000 represents the land acquisition?

Admiral CLARK. And the fill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But for the purpose of land acquisition and other improvements which are currently planned you require $4,369,000?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Now, in the light of the description of the contemplated developments, I take it, from your justification, that $41,570,000 will be required to complete all of the improvements, including land acquisition and other factors?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. To bring this naval shipyard into its final stages to meet your needs?

Admiral CLARK. To full readiness for mobilization, that is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You were speaking of barracks there, and you described the locations of barracks. From your justifications here I assumed that the personnel will be the same as indicated? The plans call for 81 officers and 90 enlisted men?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; eventually we will take care of the mobilization peak.

Mr. PALMER. At the present time there are two commands attached to the Pacific reserve fleet here. There are 2,000 military personnel varying down to 400. Two thousand other people have to be provided with barracks, and they are not attached to the command. Those attached to the command is the figure you are talking about there.

Our problem in terms of barracks is basically in terms of the activities that we service.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is, barracks for the fleet personnel when they are ashore?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What number do you anticipate at the completion of the project?

Mr. PALMER. Approximately 5,000 ashore. While we will expect to have 20,000 Navy personnel in the shipyard, only about 5,000 will have to be barracked there.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Why is it that your final planned personnel requirements will be somewhat less than at present, in the light of your expansion?

Admiral CLARK. That is not final. That is the plan for the end of 1957 for the shipyard itself.

Mr. OSTERTAG. My point was, Admiral, that according to your justification the planned personnel requirements to service the shipyard will be less after the land expansion than it is today.

What does this mean when you say personnel strength present 91 officers, 142 enlisted, and 8,578 civilian? Then under that the planned personnel is shown as 81 offices, 90 enlisted men, and 8,400 civilian.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words the planned personnel is less than the present personnel.

Admiral CLARK. There is one point there, sir——

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will you clear up where that occurs?

Admiral CLARK. This planned figure which is given you throughout this whole book is not the eventual plan. It is the firm plan for the end of 1957. In other words, we have never been able to tell exactly how big the Navy will be 2 years from now. This may be wrong next year, but for the firm peacetime planning, we have on the books the number we will get the money for. In fact, we know of only decreases right to day as we are being slightly cut. Now, the plan he is talking about is for mobilization planning and that is why we must actually build all of these buildings right away.

Furthermore, the figures do not include the fleet personnel.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I understand that, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. My point was merely whether or not it will take less personnel to run this shipyard after its completion than it currently takes to operate it.

Admiral CLARK. Next year it will, yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, there is a decrease in personnel during the immediate future?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But eventually it will take more men, and then under the mobilization program it will take many more, is that right?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, many more.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not thinking primarily of mobilization. I am talking about the normal operations in peacetime, and I can see where you are going to have a reduction and then, perhaps, a stepping up after that.

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. He has a chart here that has the personnel figures on it if you would like to see them.

Mr. PALMER. I would like, if I may, to go off the record for a minute.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are there any of your civilian personnel housed in the facility there?

Mr. PALMER. Yes. Back here in the residential area there are 1 or 2 key civilian personnel designated special duty personnel, such as docking officers, or pilots.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But, by and large, they live elsewhere?

Mr. PALMER. There is no housing of civilian personnel in basic rental quarters.

Admiral PERRY. This property has been appraised by E. G. Wendland, San Francisco, at a cost of $750.

SHIPYARD FACILITIES—OVERSEAS

FLEET ACTIVITIES, SASEBO, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected in volume 3, in order to have continuity in the record. This is under "Shipyard facilities, overseas, fleet activities, Sasebo, Japan," wherein you are asking for $57,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $487,047; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $57,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $57,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

I wish you would make the presentation for that $57,000, please.

Admiral CLARK. The only item we have nonclassified for shipyard facilities overseas is for a commissioned officers dining room at Sasebo, Japan. Again, the personnel figures at the top are misleading as far as this project is concerned, in that it illustrates the number of officers and men actually attached to the command of the fleet activity at Sasebo. Actually we have about 70 ships in port daily and the average number of officers varies from 30 to 100 ashore, with no place to dine unless they go about 1 mile and a quarter to an Army club which is being disestablished. We looked into taking that Army club, but found they are paying about $25,000 a year for maintenance. It appeared much more wise to construct a dining room to service both officers ashore and afloat and with their dependents who live in this area; so this dining room will have a capacity of about 200 people at one sitting.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this been engineered on the same premise as those we have heretofore discussed?

Admiral PERRY. It was. This project has been advance planned at Government expense by our officer in charge of construction who is stationed at Sasebo. These figures are based upon the construction factor which we have in Japan of 1.2. That is, we have found by experience that in Japan a structure will cost us 1.2 times as much as it would in the United States, and these figures are based upon that cost factor.

CLASSIFIED PROJECTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are no questions pertaining to this item, we will go back to the classified projects, wherein you are asking a total of $151,342,400. This has to do with all bureaus that are making requests for this total.

Being of a classified character, we will try to treat it as such. However, I would like you to prepare a general statement that would give Members of Congress some idea of the procedure without breaching the security element. If you will do that and provide it for the record at this point, we will proceed with the rest of our investigation of these projects off of the record.

(The information is as follows:)

The classified portion of our public works request amounts to $151,342,400. The first project, sponsored by the Bureau of Ships is for a classified program which I shall describe in detail to the committee off the record. Some of the stations are overseas, and some in the continental United States. This particular project totals $7,834,000.

Of our remaining program, there are two projects for the Continental United States totaling $5,243,000. One is for a special school, and the other is for a communication facility.

The remainder of the classified projects are located overseas. They include:

For the Bureau of Aeronautics five projects for aviation facilities, such as airborne early warning stations, and certain portions of our construction in Spain.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is sponsoring three projects in Spain. These are for a small number of family housing units for the key personnel who must live aboard the facilities that are under construction.

The Marine Corps is requesting two projects, both in the Pacific area. These are both for camp facilities.

The Bureau of Ordnance is sponsoring projects for ammunition storage and family housing at two locations. Again, the family housing is for a small number of people who must live aboard the ammunition depots.

The final item is for communication facilities overseas.

We shall justify these projects to the committee in detail off the record. The reasons why some of these projects, which normally might be considered nonclassified, are contained in the classified category include one or more of the following:

(*a*) Location in a foreign country where base rights or other negotiations are going on;

(*b*) The mission of the station may contain information of a classified nature;

(*c*) The base loading and the planned assignment of aircraft and personnel should be kept classified; or,

(*d*) The specific utilization of the base should not now be divulged.

SHIPYARD FACILITIES OVERSEAS

We will pick up the first item under "Shipyard facilities overseas," in which your appropriation request is $7,834,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $7,834,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $7,834,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $5,083,000.

Proceed with the explanation off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, give us the engineering data on this request.

Admiral PERRY. The engineering has all been done within the Bureau of Yards and Docks. These are classified projects. We have made a close study of all of the items which are required at any one of these stations and while we do not claim infallibility—certainly there are differences in cost depending upon the exact site of the station in question—nevertheless we feel that the figures which we have here represent an average cost and I believe we can do the jobs within the estimates which are given.

(Discussion off the record.)

Fleet Base Facilities—Continental United States

Mr. Sheppard. We will turn to volume No. 1 under "Fleet base facilities—continental United States." Before we go into the details, I would like a statement as to the method wherein these expenditures are made compared to the so-called facilities financed under your appropriation request—just a general policy statement.

Admiral Perry. I assume, Mr. Chairman, from your question you refer to the provisions of the general appropriation bill for the Navy.

Mr. Sheppard. That is right.

Admiral Perry. Whereby moneys appropriated for the purchase of guns, ammunition, planes, and plane engines can be used for the construction of the facilities either by the Government or by industry to produce the products which the Government itself is purchasing?

Mr. Sheppard. In general, that is what my question is directed to and it is somewhat inappropriate to this present consideration, certainly, but I am trying to find out whether there is any parallel in what we are presently reviewing.

Admiral Perry. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it would be more appropriate for a statement to be put in the record outlining the whole detail; because I do not delve intimately into the problem.

Mr. Sheppard. Please have a statement of that character placed in the record.

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Understand what I am asking for—I want to determine the responsibility or latitude in expenditures under the facilities account. You will prepare and supply this for the record. Is there any parallel you know of in expenditures of the category we are about to review, as compared to those in the general bill? If there is a parallel, then I want you to give me the parallel as it applies to what we are considering.

Admiral Clark. I will be glad to supply that for the record.

(The following was submitted later:)

There is a parallel under the "Facilities, Navy" appropriation title you refer to, Mr. Chairman. It was originated as an account, with a limitation in total amount, to which funds from Navy appropriations could be transferred to cover expenses necessary for production and test facilities related to procurement as contrasted to facilities that are needed for the direct support of Navy operating forces and the shore establishment which we are presently discussing.

The "Facilities, Navy," appropriation title was omitted this year. Its functions are provided for in the appropriation language of "Aircraft and related procurement," "Shipbuilding and conversion" and "Navy military procurement."

As stated before, the facilities to be constructed which we are now discussing are the operational-type facilities required for support of the fleet and Shore Establishment. There is no duplication between these two types of facilities.

Family Housing, Washington, D. C., for Flag Officers

Mr. Sheppard. The first item we will pick up is "Navy Department, Washington, D. C.," an item for family housing of flag officers in the amount of $81,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is not applicable; funded construction not in the plant value, not applicable; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $81,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $81,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $189,000.

Please make a presentation of this request, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This request is for three flag officers' quarters in Washington for a total of $81,000. These are to be for the three Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations who have no quarters. They are to be located on the Naval Observatory land, and we have approval from the Chief of Naval Operations as to their location. They are to cost $27,000 each, for a total of $81,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume this has something to do with the release we had in the paper some several months ago when Admiral Radford came back to town and you did not have any place to put him without moving rank for rank. The problem of getting one rank out of a place and putting another one in was rather difficult to solve.

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. This came before Admiral Radford made his request. Admiral Radford made his request to the Secretary of Defense and I understand there is a title in the bill to provide housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and members of his staff. The Navy is not sponsoring that. This is for three Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are the three officers now housed for whom you are requesting housing accommodations?

Admiral CLARK. They are presently housed in the community of Washington in private housing and, with their workload, they find it extremely difficult to live without quarters, to keep up with their workload, pay for, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they in rental property now?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. I think some of them have bought their own homes, but they will move should these be provided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The three houses are to be constructed on the property of the United States Naval Observatory?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have these houses been engineered, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. The same remarks apply for these houses, Mr. Chairman, that I have made concerning other family housing at other places.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this housing as presently planned meets with the approval of the proposed occupants?

Admiral PERRY. I have not discussed the matter with the proposed occupants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The reason for my question was obvious, because perhaps your tentative plans may not meet their approval; there will have to be some additions, subtractions, or replacements to suit the convenience of the individual.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, we have certain limitations placed upon us by the Defense Department, beyond which we cannot go with regard to the construction of quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any inquiries pertaining to this issue?

Mr. ANDREWS. Who do you plan to have build them?

Admiral PERRY. They will be built by private contractors.

Mr. ANDREWS. At $27,000 apiece?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. My observation has been that you cannot get too much of a house for $27,000.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Andrews, we still have that limitation placed on us.

Mr. ANDREWS. You might want to answer this off of the record, but what would be the advantage of having those officers live on the Naval Observatory grounds, instead of living where they are?

(Discussion off the record.)

NAVAL STATION, GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item under fleet facilities "Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Fla.," to modify the power distribution system on 11 piers, wherein you are asking for $72,000.

At this installation the plant value is $20,110,202; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $72,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $72,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $4,285,000.

Make the presentation for this request, please.

Admiral CLARK. 380 ships of the Atlantic Fleet use the station at Green Cove Springs, Fla., and are berthed at 11 piers. The existing power distribution permits 20 ships to receive power through 1 circuit breaker and, under this system, there is frequent necessity of first reducing the load before they can cut out any 1 section for repairs. This requires shutting down the dehumidification, which is a technical and time-consuming operation; also, the dehumidification is not operable while the repairs are going on.

This proposed system of modification of the power distribution on the piers will permit the disconnecting of one nest of ships without interrupting service to the adjacent ships during the repairs and maintenance. We are requesting a total of $72,000 to install 145 circuit breakers. The station estimates an annual saving of about $4,000 will result from this improvement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this item been engineered upon the same premise as those previously discussed?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. This was advance planned at Government expense by the District Public Works Office of the Sixth Naval District in Charleston, S. C.

NAVAL STATION, KEY WEST, FLA., FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval station, Key West, Fla., family housing," in which you are asking for $1,044,500.

The plant value is $45,626,131; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, $1,044,500; the proposed 1956 authorization, none; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,044,500; and the estimated future appropriation required, $6,952,500.

Proceed and make your presentation for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. We are requesting 7 junior officers' houses and 73 enlisted houses for a total of 80 houses at $1,044,500.

There is a very critical shortage of housing at Key West, Mr. Chairman, and this will alleviate a very difficult situation wherein a high percentage of the enlisted men cannot afford to bring their families to Key West.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you have no comparable housing at this time?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; we have some comparable housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I meant was comparable to take care of the workload requirements.

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; we have not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been engineered, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir. Again I make this statement that we have accepted the limitations for individual sets of quarters as imposed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is reasonable to assume that when they are engineered and ready for contractual purposes, you may find deviations in the ceilings you have used here?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, we have recently taken bids on certain items of housing within the Sixth Naval District, and in three cases we have come within the money limitation. In one case we did not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you reach a situation where you do not come within the limitation, what is the procedure that follows thereafter in order to obtain the required structure?

Admiral PERRY. If we can make some changes in the plans and specifications that we feel might bring it within the limitation, we do so. In the instance which I mentioned, we did not see how we could reduce anything.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you mean by that, that you just are not going to get those properties, even though they are considered as a military requirement?

Admiral PERRY. That is the present rule; yes, sir. We were able, finally, to finance this project by using our administrative reserves and utilizing the maximum 10 percent overrun allowed by law.

Let me point out, further, that in the case in which we did not come within the limitation which has been laid down, we only had a few units to build. Now you can readily understand if we have a large number of units, all constructed according to the same general plan, a contractor can go in and follow a production-line method in his construction and, consequently, we will get a better price than we would if we have only 2 or 3 units to build.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Hypothetically, let us assume you have participated in a function of that character wherein under the production-line method on station X you required 400 housing units and because of the construction line aspect you would have saved fifty, sixty or one hundred thousand dollars, would you then be permitted to add that saving to the requirement, although it exceeds the limitation?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you sure of that?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. We can check that with Captain McFarland.

Captain MCFARLAND. Yes, sir.

Admiral PERRY. But the limitation that is given us is given us on the basis of an average price.

If we are able to save anything in Key West, we can apply that saving toward properties elsewhere. Now we have not in the Navy gone far enough into these projects to have generated any particular savings thus far.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it would only be your economy in one project that would permit you to go ahead and construct where you exceeded the established ceiling of $15,200 and $12,850?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. Can you do that?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Admiral CLARK. I think there is one aspect you forgot to cover; that is, we cannot exceed the average for the type of house that is given in the bill. Is that not correct?

Captain MCFARLAND. There is another point. Under Public Law 765, which was the authorization bill for this particular housing, we were allowed a variation of 10 percent in any individual case. The average for that entire bill had to hit those various figures for the Navy Department; but in any case we could not go above 10 percent.

Mr. ANDREWS. The upshot of that was it increased your limitation.

Captain MCFARLAND. For particular projects; but we had to go below on some other projects.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let us assume that down at Key West you are not able to get 73 units for naval quarters at $12,850.

Captain MCFARLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let us assume the cheapest bid you could get for 73 units of that particular type of housing would be $13,000—say $14,000, which would be above your 10-percent cushion. You could not make that contract?

Captain MCFARLAND. You could not go above 10 percent, and you could not go up to 10 percent unless you had a saving on another project which would allow you to keep within the average total for the program.

Mr. ANDREWS. What effect, if any, have you observed with that limitation as to the bids you get?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Andrews, I cannot see that the limitation has affected our bidding. We try to design these houses so that, when we go into the market, we can get bids that will come within the limitation.

Mr. ANDREWS. I understand that; but my point is this: Suppose it is generally known in the community down there that you have a limitation of $12,850 per unit for enlisted quarters, does that mean all of your bidders are going to stick to that $12,850, or will any of them get under it?

Admiral PERRY. I think that same question was discussed yesterday, Mr. Andrews. If you have a glut on the construction market, there might be a tendency on the part of individuals who presented bids to be rather generous in their estimates and, therefore, present high bids. It has been our experience in the past year, however, that there has been no glut of work on the construction market and we have been able to receive a number of bids on each project that we had.

Now if we had only one of these houses to be built, I rather doubt we would get too keen an interest among the contracting fraternity generally; because, what does it amount to? It amounts to a $15,000 job. Most of the contractors are not in the market for $15,000 jobs; they want quite a number of thousands when they make a bid.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the competitive factor enters into whether you will have some excess funds that might enable you to exceed the limitation. That is about your only opportunity, and then you can only go to 10 percent?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you get into a geographical situation where it exceeds 10 percent, you will not have any excess funds under existing law?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

NAVAL STATION, NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will take up the naval station at Newport, R. I., wherein you are requesting $1,583,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $39,713,888; funded construction not in the plant value, $4,961,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,583,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,583,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $8,526,000.

Will you make your presentation?

Admiral CLARK. This station supports a large number of activities including the Naval War College, naval base headquarters, naval communication station, a naval schools command, and a fleet training center.

There is a current barracks space requirement for 4,000 men of the 6,300 enlisted personnel stationed at or supported by this activity. On mobilization the number of personnel to be supported will increase to approximately 19,000.

The barracks in use now are all of temporary type construction and badly deteriorated. All wood framing below the first floor sill is rotted. Sills, joists, studding, sheathing, and flooring are old and deteriorated, and all require replacement. The plumbing consists of wartime materials and requires constant repair and replacement. Gutters and spouts all require replacement. The electrical system is old. In many places the wood is so rotted that it is unable to hold nails or screws. The commandant of the First Naval District has placed the replacement of these barracks at the top of his priority list for the whole naval district.

This is the first increment of replacement of those barracks. We are incrementing it because we have to keep on operating up there. Otherwise they really should all be replaced now. This is the first increment, asking for 5 barracks buildings for a total of $1,583,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this project been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. It has, by Coletti Bros. of Boston, Mass., at a cost of $10,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. What type of construction do you plan?

Admiral PERRY. Three-story reinforced concrete barracks, 238 by 30 feet to accommodate 172 men.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is permanent construction?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. The ones in use there now are wood?

Admiral PARRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. There are no permanent buildings there?

Admiral CLARK. Not in this barracks group.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.

Mr. Sheppard. We will take up the next item, naval base, Norfolk, Va. You are asking for a total of $9,972,000 and the breakdown is depicted on page 3 of the justifications.

I note at this installation the plant value is $197,650,408; funded construction not in the plant value, $2,824,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $9,972,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $9,972,000; and the estimated future appropriation required $26,148,000.

Please make your presentation.

Admiral Clark. This is a large requirement, as you see. There is a critical shortage of pier space for berthing ships of the Atlantic fleet at the naval base at Norfolk. There is a shortage in total amount of space and also a shortage in the number of berths that will accommodate ships over 600 feet in length, that is, battleships and carriers. The 2 piers that will accommodate large ships, permit docking only 2 large carriers or 3 battleships at the same time whereas concentrations of from 7 to 12 have occurred every month from October 1953 to August 1954.

Since there is also a shortage of large anchorages there are frequently times when large ships must be diverted to other areas. This is a very serious handicap in our ability to supply and provision a task force prior to sailing.

We have also been forced to lease dock space at a cost of approximately $12,000 a year.

Another critical deficiency is in the type of pier required to berth *Forrestal* carriers and the modified older carriers having angled flight decks. We must bring these alongside at Norfolk and have the necessary pier space and tracked cranes for off-loading aircraft so that they may be taxied or towed to the aircraft repair shops and replaced with overhauled planes.

Norfolk is the only harbor on the Atlantic coast that has the required depth of water without either extensive or expensive dredging alongside a pier that is close to an industrial naval air station.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, the expansion program and the work indicated is made necessary by the workload that you will have there plus modification of certain portions of the project. Is that correct?

Admiral Clark. Yes. I have a picture. We have a long-range plan. This is the first increment.

Mr. Sheppard. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Admiral Clark. The second item for Norfolk is a request for a power substation to provide direct current power to finger piers which are used to berth small self-propelled craft. These crews must eat aboard the ships and if they can get the power from the land we will save about $22,700 a year in being able to shut down the individual powerplants aboard these small ships.

Mr. Sheppard. This is a requirement of $172,000?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. Has a portion of this project been engineered?

Admiral Perry. Both of these have been engineered; the first by the staff of the district public works officer at Government expense;

and the second by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, of Norfolk, Va., for $2,685.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, ORANGE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now take up the naval station at Orange, Tex., wherein you are asking for $399,000.

The plant value is $8,677,304; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, $0; the proposed 1956 authorization, $399,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $399,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,006,000.

Will you make your presentation as to the requirements?

Admiral CLARK. This is similar to the Newport requirement in that the barracks they are living in, in Orange, Tex., are old, temporary, badly deteriorated wartime construction. They have the additional defect that there has been some settlement of the buildings which were built on not-too-firm land, so that the concrete floors in the washrooms are cracking and the subfloors are rotted.

We propose to build a three-story permanent barracks at a full cost of $399,000, and also a subsistence building to go with that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what is the type of structure you are going to use there?

Admiral PERRY. We will use the floor plan for a standard 172-man barracks. However, we propose to make it of structural steel frame with brick walls because after the engineering was completed on it we found we could get it cheaper than the standard reinforced concrete building. The cost per man for the barracks building in this instance is $1,326, whereas, if you will refer to Newport, it is $1,481. Advance planning was done by Turner & Beard, Houston, Tex., at a cost of $1,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions pertaining to this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice the existing facilities there are on hydraulic fill. That is poor foundation, is it not?

Admiral PERRY. It need not be if the fill has had sufficient time to settle and assuming the materials you pumped in there originally were of a satisfactory nature. In other words, if you did not pump in muck and a lot of decomposed vegetation it would be all right.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you plan to put the new building on the same foundation?

Admiral PERRY. No, on the same land but not the same foundation.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now take up the next item, the naval station, San Diego, Calif. The request is $57,000.

The plant value is $55,161,566; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,474,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $57,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $57,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,146,000.

Please present your requirements for this appropriation request.

Admiral CLARK. This is an economy move. This project will amortize itself in a little over a year. We want to connect the South Bay Area Naval Station to the main station and supply steam from the main station. Actually, now we have to operate a large boiler with a steam-generating capacity of 100,000 pounds of steam an hour whereas the generating capacity of another one is adequate to supply both the steam requirements of the main station and that of the South Bay area. This will permit us to shut down one boiler and realize a saving of about $42,000 a year, so it will amortize the project in 2 years.

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by the staff of the District Public Works Officer at Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No.

NAVAL STATION, TREASURE ISLAND, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will take up the next station, Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif. Your total request is $3,147,000 and the breakdown is reflected on page C2–6.

I note at this installation the plant value is $32,095,066; funded construction not in the plant value, $4,142,000; existing unfunded authorization; none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,147,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,147,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $21,592,000.

Will you proceed to make your presentation as to the requirements?

Admiral CLARK. This station is required to house a daily average of about 400 bachelor officers, with a peak requirement of about 625. The present facilities accommodate only 275 at 2Z sittings in the mess and at times it has been necessary to feed 418 officers in 5 sittings.

The present barracks are old, with fiberboard partitions, but we intend to keep using it for transient officers, and by putting in a permanent bachelor officers' quarters for the permanent officers we will be able to satisfy the requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see reflected here a proposed five-story building. Is that an innovation?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. We are crowded for space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you do not have enough ground space and you have to go up in the air?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In building the quarters, will you conform with California's building requirements?

Admiral PERRY. You mean in regard to earthquakes?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In regard to earthquakes in that area.

Admiral PERRY. Every building we construct in California conforms with the code for earthquake proofing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Within the areas where the earthquake code applies?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this requirement been engineered, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. Yes. The advance planning was done by Ward & Boyles of San Francisco, Calif., at a cost of $32,750.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the money is granted for this requirement, when do you figure it would be completed and ready for occupancy?

Admiral PERRY. Assuming we receive the money on the 1st of July 1955, it would not be ready for occupancy until about the 15th of March 1957.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What schooling facilities do you have there presently?

Admiral CLARK. Mostly fleet schools, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By the way, are those school buildings of a permenent or temporary construction.

Admiral CLARK. Most of them are temporary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your temporary categories in that geographical location, taking a normal building that you would say would have a life of 20 years, what is the comparative longevity of the buildings in the bay area? Is it 12 to 15 years?

Admiral PERRY. I do not feel that it is, Mr. Chairman. Of course when you mention longevity of any building in any locality, you must also take into account how much you spend on it for maintenance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This would indicate a point of diminishing return. What is your maintenance cost in that geographical area in comparison with drier climates?

Admiral PERRY. In drier climates, naturally, assuming you do not have bugs, your maintenance cost would be far less than in the bay area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Admiral CLARK. You understood, Mr. Chairman, that the second item for Treasure Island was not a cable for the barracks. It is a separate item to combine the metering of electrical power at Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island under one master metering arrangement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that.

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning was done by the district public works officer staff at Government expense.

NAVAL STATION, TACOMA, WASH.

We will proceed to the next item, the naval station at Tacoma, Wash., wherein you are asking for $3,024,000. The breakdown is reflected on page C2–7.

This installation shows that the plant value is $7,168,023; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,024,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,024,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $8,790,000.

Will you make your presentation as to the requirements at that station?

Admiral CLARK. At the naval station at Tacoma, Wash., we are requesting permission to reconstruct pier 4. This station berths, services, repairs, and maintains 36 ships of the Reserve Fleet, of which 24 are escort carriers.

The pier we are asking to replace provides berthing and related services for about 14 of those carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you say 14 or 15?

Admiral CLARK. Fourteen. The pier was built in 1942.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pardon me, but it does have a capacity for 15, is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, you can get 15 alongside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead.

Admiral CLARK. The pier was built in 1942 of untreated pile construction. In 1953 the decking gave way so it is now necessary to restrict the loading of the decking and they cannot get on that pier with the machinery they need to maintain the ships. We are requesting permission to replace that pier at a cost of $3,024,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this project been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, by H. J. Whitacre and Associates of Tacoma, Wash., at a cost of $4,510.

Mr SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, TONGUE POINT, ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will proceed to the next item, the naval station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg., wherein you are asking for $92,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $15,175,202; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $92,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $92,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,157,000.

Will you present your requirements at that station?

Admiral CLARK. This item is required to provide a means of emergency egress from bedrooms of 364 public quarters occupied by both married officers and married enlisted men. These were constructed so that there is no way of getting out of the bedrooms. You have a solid window and the openings in the window are so small that literally in time of fire women and children and others could not get out except through the kitchen and into an areaway which leads to the entrances front and back.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that type of construction meet the building requirements of the State of Oregon?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How did we happen to have them in the first place?

Admiral PERRY. When these quarters were built, Mr. Chairman, we had insufficient funds and we had to compromise our design in order to accomplish the project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the composition of that structure?

Admiral CLARK. Wood frame.

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning was by the staff of the District Public Works Officer at Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Andrews.

Mr. ANDREWS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Fleet Base Facilities—Overseas

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska

Mr. Sheppard. All right, gentlemen, under "Fleet facilities" we find an item at the Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, wherein you are requesting a total appropriation of $2,485,000.

The plant value is $64,988,738; funded construction not in the plant value, $3,283,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,485,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,485,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $15,715,000.

Will you give us an explanation of that item?

Admiral Clark. This is for family housing, where we are requesting 2 sets of senior officer (field grade) quarters, 7 junior officer (company grade) quarters, 61 enlisted quarters, and 1 civilian quarters, a total of 71 quarters for $2,485,000.

This item is urgently required to alleviate the critical housing shortage at Adak, Alaska, an isolated station, and includes housing for the naval station personnel, the naval communication station, and limited requirements for the Army, Air Force, and also a few of the Coast Guard.

Mr. Sheppard. I notice that all of the housing—for senior officers (field grade), junior officers (company grade), enlisted, and civilian—carry a unit cost of $35,000 each. Because of the different square footage of each type, why don't you show the distinction as previously has been practiced?

Admiral Perry. May I ask Captain McFarland, who is the housing expert, to answer that question?

Mr. Sheppard. Yes, as you wish.

Mr. Andrews. Before he answers the question, I would like to ask, in connection with your question, I notice the square-foot average for enlisted men is 950, and for senior officers 1,500 square feet, and for civilians 1,125 square feet, and yet the unit cost of each is the same.

Mr. Sheppard. An explanation is certainly indicated.

Captain McFarland. The situation in Adak is complicated by the cost factor and the legal limitation. The cost factor is 3.0, which, when applied at Adak puts them all over $35,000. They run from $38,000 to $60,000 if you apply your cost factor. But we have a legal limitation of $35,000 on all overseas construction and an average of $25,850, which means that no house we can build at Adak can cost more than $35,000.

Mr. Sheppard. So what you are doing is setting a top of $35,000 although you fully anticipate that it will cost less under your square footage as delineated in your explanation, but in order to get the money this is the method you are pursuing. Is that true?

Admiral Perry. Not necessarily. If you take the enlisted men's housing, where the limitation stateside is $12,850, and you multiply that by 3, you still get $38,550. We are hopeful that, again, because of mass production we may be able to bring these houses within the legal limitation.

Mr. Sheppard. Pardon the interruption, Admiral. In other words, it evidently is going to cost more money in this geographical location

to build quarters for senior officers that contain 1,500 square feet average. Is that not true?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So in order to build these houses, when you consider the square-foot cost and the deviation on the square-foot requirements, in order to get the houses you will have to put them all at $35,000?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you do not mind my comments on this aspect, I think it is an unfortunate way of having to provide the necessary funds for military requirements. It is not making a presentation in accordance with actual cost on a unit basis to accommodate senior officers, junior officers, enlisted men, and civilians that will have to have housing.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I will agree with you, sir.

Admiral CLARK. This project was No. 1 in our whole housing program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not criticizing that. I am definitely criticizing the modus operandi under an act that is not conducive to square-shooting appropriation operations.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will stand adjourned until 1:30.

NAVAL BASE, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order. We will take up the next item which is "Naval base, Guam," wherein you are asking for an appropriation of $1,835,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $43,426,957; funded construction not in the plant value, $10,132,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,835,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,835,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $18,669,000.

Admiral, you will present your justification for the appropriation request, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the headquarters for the Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. His present headquarters were built during World War II, made out of defense base materials having a life expectancy of 5 years. After 10 years these temporary structures have outlived their usefulness, and are in an advanced state of deterioration. In fact, of the 7 temporary buildings that he was occupying, 2 were so badly damaged in the typhoon of 1949 that they had to be razed.

The remaining buildings are in such bad shape that if they had another typhoon his whole headquarters might come down around his ears.

In addition, that type structure deteriorates very rapidly in the very damp climate of Guam.

This will provide a headquarters building including a typhoon-proof superstructure with a basement for his operational command control center.

So, this is an expensive proposition, in that it is both a typhoon-proof headquarters and includes this basement operational command

control center which has to be of splinter-proof construction, and, of course, as Admiral Perry will tell you, we have a construction factor that we have to apply in Guam in addition, which runs the price up to a total of $1,835,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral, has this project been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; we have a design force in the Office of the Director of the Pacific Division of the Bureau of Yards and Docks which has gone into this project thoroughly and the results are as shown in these estimates which are given in this book.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

NAVAL BASE, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

All right, we will proceed with the next item, Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, wherein you are asking for an appropriation of $56,000.

I note the plant value is $22,168,795; funded construction not in the plant value, $3,026,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $56,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $56,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $17,896,566.

Please make your presentation, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This is simply for the surfacing of a dirt road that goes from the Kittery Beach area to the main station, over which there is very heavy vehicular traffic, and the combination of rains and heavy traffic runs up our maintenance cost for vehicles.

We estimate that the maintenance cost for this road may be reduced by $7,000 a year if it is given a proper surface.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this project been engineered, and if so by whom?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned at Government expense by the Office of the District Public Works Officer of the Tenth Naval District with headquarters at San Juan, P. R.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you consider the quotation of the square yard cost a reasonable estimate?

Admiral PERRY. I do, sir. As you may be aware, the construction factor for work done in Guantanamo is 1.4.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

NAVAL BASE, SUBIC BAY, PHILIPPINES

All right, in the absence of questions we will proceed to the next item, Naval Base, Subic Bay, wherein you are asking for an appropriation of $7,514,700.

The plant value is $6,749,581; funded construction not in the plant value, $17,349,000; existing unfunded authorization, $5,446,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $10,865,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $7,739,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $108,557,000.

Admiral, you will present your justification for this request.

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this represents another increment of our Philippine construction, and consists of a series of items, the first of which is for the construction and funding of the power plant

and the electric distribution system for the Subic Bay area. We had an increment in 1954 and in the fiscal year 1955.

This is the third increment for the purchase and installation of power distribution and telephone systems in the area, and they are required to be in operation by July 1, 1956, when the air facility at Subic Point will be officially commissioned.

Shall I proceed with the other items before your questions, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, just a minute, please.

Admiral CLARK. There are more items for Subic Bay.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see under your family housing item that you fail to delineate your unit costs here, having copied the procedure that we discussed prior to the lunch hour with relation to the Alaska situation, is that correct, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. This particular item here is only for the site development. If you are speaking of Item 6 we already have an existing authorization.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was not speaking of Item 6. I was addressing myself to Item 1, which is reflected on the first page that I have before me under Naval Base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands.

Admiral PERRY. Item 1, Mr. Chairman, is power distribution and telephone system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It may be in your book, but in the book I have here it is family housing. Maybe something has happened to my book.

Admiral CLARK. The item of $7,514,000?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. That actually got into my book as the last item. This is for 373 sets of quarters, 15 for senior officers, 45 for junior officers, and 313 for enlisted men.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us get ourselves oriented here. In making your justification, and I address myself to the $7,514,000, or your total figure.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have already justified what portion of it?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir. There is another item for the site preparation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Admiral CLARK. Family housing, $7,514,700.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is what I am inquiring into.

So, proceed with your justification for $7,514,700.

Admiral CLARK. This is for family housing, new facilities, including Cubi Point naval air facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. You can see from looking at the figures that the officer personnel and the enlisted personnel are due to increase very radically in the next year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Now, Admiral Perry, will you advise me as to whether this particular item of family housing has been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir. The same remark, Mr. Chairman, applies to this particular item of family housing as to the other items of family housing with which we have dealt earlier in the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the cost factor?

Admiral PERRY. 1.5.

Mr. ANDREWS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turn over to your next page, gentlemen, if you will, and I find that we have a proposed project here for power distribution, which is the next item, wherein you are asking for $3,058,000. Will you justify this request, please?

Admiral CLARK. This is part of the incremental buildup for the Philippine Island facilities. First in 1954 we got over $3 million for the design of the powerplant and the procurement of powerplant equipment, and in the fiscal year 1955 we got $2,754,000 for the construction of the concrete building for the plant.

This is the third increment for the purpose of installation of the distribution and the telephone systems for the area, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice, Admiral, that you have this indicated under a star as lump sums. What do you define as a lump sum as expressed in the justifications I have before me?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, under item A, electrical distribution, primary and secondary systems, in the detailed justification we have several hundred items which we break down, and it includes primary feeders to the systems within the following areas: the dependent housing area; to Olangapo Village; to the Naval Supply Annex; and to the Naval Station. That is what that includes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your lump sum as reflected hypothetically under the $2,182,000 is an accumulation of a series of components and operations that go into the detail that you have in your breakdown in the justifications, is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please give me the usual engineering information on this project.

Admiral PERRY. This particular project was advance planned by Bently, Kellberg & Pugh of San Francisco, Calif. at a cost of $15,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we turn the next page and come to item 2, enlisted men's barracks, for which you are requesting $1,325,000.

You will present your justification for that requirement, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This is the second item for Subic Bay, and is the first increment in the replacement program of deteriorated enlisted men's barracks with permanent barracks.

At the present time the men are quartered in quonset huts which were built during the war and have passed their designed life and badly require renewal. We are requesting a total of $1,325,000 for this first increment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this item been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. All items on this page, Mr. Chairman, that is, items 2, 3, and 4, and including items 5 and 6 on sheets 3 and 4 were advance planned by the Bechtel Corp. of San Francisco, sir, at a cost of $44,150.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, let us take the next item that is reflected in my book as enlisted men's subsistence building where you are making a request for $783,000. Present your justification for that request, please, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This, like the one preceding, sir, is for replacement. The existing galley, bakery, and messhall are all of World War II temporary construction and are deteriorated and too small to handle

the anticipated complement. So this subsistence building will take care of 1,000 people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you confronted with the same requirement in building structures of this character that you are in the case of those on Guam?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir, except that here because of the hurricane conditions which prevail in the Philippines, and also because of the earthquake prevalence we have to design all of these buildings for a 105-mile-per-hour wind and for a Zone Z earthquake disturbance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the item which is cataloged as "covered passageway"? I am assuming that normally it would be a connecting element between two structural factors, but it could be something else.

Admiral PERRY. It is a passageway, Mr. Chairman, between the barracks and the subsistence building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see.

All right, gentlemen, let us take up item 4, "Bachelor officers' quarters and mess", wherein you are making your request for $1,073,000.

Admiral CLARK. This also is a replacement. The existing bachelor officers' quarters consist of seven modified quonset huts which are both inadequate in size and in an advanced state of deterioration. Eventually we expect 160 officers will be required, but in this increment that we are asking for authority to accommodate only 88 officers with a mess that will accommodate eventually 160 officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, specifically inquiring about quonset huts, when those huts reach their present stage, is there any recovery dollarwise?

Admiral PERRY. None at all, and particularly with respect to the quonset huts in question here because they are of wartime vintage and have long outlived their usefulness. Of course, there will be a certain amount of recoverable material that could be realized from the equipment that might be in those huts. For example, the toilets and lavatories. The toilets themselves could probably be used over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But wherever there is value in appurtenances of that character obviously they would be used if they are reusable?

Admiral PERRY. They will be used if they are reusable, you are certainly right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us take up item 5, "Infirmary," where you are making a request for $1,500,000. Present your justification for this requirement, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This is the second increment for the infirmary to provide adequate medical facilities to serve approximately 22,684 persons who are eligible for medical care in the Subic area. The first increment is under construction, and that provided 26 beds. This increment is for 32 beds and includes a mess hall, galley, and a standby powerplant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All of the following items under 5 contribute to the same operation, do they not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. This infirmary is located halfway between the naval station and the naval air station, and that is why we have to have a garage and a small anesthetic storage at this locality.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you figure you are going to require in your steam and standby power there? What kilowatt delivery of emergency requirements would be the end result when you get your standby power for that purpose?

Admiral PERRY. I would have to supply that information for the record, Mr. Chairman, because I do not have it readily available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

The equipment will include one 300-kilowatt diesel generator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gatehouse as expressed here I assume is typical of a gatehouse elsewhere, is it not?

Admiral PERRY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item for Subic Bay is item 6, "Family housing site development," for which you are requesting $3,426,000. You will make your presentation for that requirement, please, Admiral.

Admiral CLARK. This is the site development for family housing which was authorized by Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress and this year we are asking for the appropriation to go ahead with that, sir. We asked for the authorization previously in order that plans could be firmed up, but the condition was such that we did not need the actual money to construct until this year, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the situation pertaining to engineering here? Is it the same as those you have previously referred to, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. In the case of this particular item it was advance planned by the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco. The cost of this item and the previous item were included in the $44,150 total mentioned under "Enlisted men's barracks."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions pertaining to the operations to which we have been referring?

FLEET ACTIVITIES, YOKOSUKA, JAPAN

All right, we will turn over to the next tab, which is fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan, wherein you are making a request for $6,540,800 for family housing.

I note at this installation the plant value is $4,000,166; funded construction not in the plant value, $2,348,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $6,540,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $6,540,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, $6,010,200.

Will you proceed with your justification for that requirement, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. We have a heavy requirement in Yokosuka for family housing. This year we are asking for a total of 408 units, 3 for senior officers of field grade, 79 for junior officers of company grade, and 326 for enlisted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see these are listed as the unit costs: For your senior officer of field grade the cost is $24,300, for your junior officer of company grade the cost is $18,240, and for your enlisted men the cost is $15,420.

This is new and not a replacement in any of its aspects, is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this was engineered by whom, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. The same remark, Mr. Chairman, applies to this item of family housing as applied to the rest of them in that there has been no advance planning. Japan has a 1.2 cost factor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions, gentlemen, upon this issue?

Mr. ANDREWS. How many units of permanent housing do you have at this base at the present time?

Admiral CLARK. I will ask Captain McFarland to answer that.

Captain MCFARLAND. We have now 281 units of public quarters for officers and 679 for enlisted personnel which are considered adequate. They are, for the most part, under Army control and we utilize their housing.

Mr. ANDREWS. So this will give you 408 additional units?

Captain MCFARLAND. Yes, sir. We have a net requirement, even using available community assets, which total 125 units, of 228 officer and 551 enlisted and we are providing by this program for 82 officers and 326 enlisted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This committee will stand adjourned subject to the call of the chair.

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1955.

AVIATION FACILITIES—CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order.

Admiral RUSSELL. I am Rear Adm. J. S. Russell, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics and have management responsibility for this portion of the program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Present your statement, please.

Admiral RUSSELL. The Bureau of Aeronautics' portion of the Navy's fiscal year 1956 public works appropriation request totals $328,838,500. Of this, $188,268,900 is requested for the development of aviation facilities within the continental limits of the United States and $140,569,600 is requested for the development of our stations overseas.

Before going on with a detailed examination of individual projects, I would like to review, with you, the expanded and modernized base development program, designed for use by high-performance aircraft from which stems the need for the fiscal year 1956 funding program.

The modern jet-propelled aircraft is a weapon of tremendous power, daily increasing the horizons of altitude and speed while shrinking the horizons of time and distance. They need longer runways on which to take off and land, more air room in which to work, more fuel to take them high and fast, and more people to keep them flying.

The operations of modern jet-propelled aircraft have required a complete reanalysis of airfields and base facilities, flying training areas, target and gunnery training areas, and airspace requirements of naval aviation. When the jets have completed their missions, they must be brought down rapidly and precisely to keep them from exhausting their fuel supply. Coming in fast from high and far and probably through an overcast sky, there is no time to search for the base,

hence the urgent need for the latest and best in navigation aids and electronic control equipment. The necessary flat-approach angles to runways dictate that obstructions be removed and rigid restrictions for obstacle control be initiated. Because of their high speeds, the margin for pilot error in jets is low as is the time for pilot reaction to a hazardous situation. Every effort must be made to eliminate airfield hazards.

Your attention has been invited in the past by both the Air Force and the Navy to the fact that, because of the blast from the jet engine, parking areas must be larger and both parking areas and taxiways must be heat and blast resistant and of heavier construction. High rates of fuel consumption require more fuel storage and arrangements to provide high rates of fuel delivery to the aircraft.

As we modernize our aircraft carriers with stronger and angled flight decks, steam catapults, and improved arresting gear, so must we modernize the aircraft facilities ashore which support the fleet.

This disparity between the World War II aviation facilities and those required for our new aircraft is tremendous. This situation was foreseen several years ago and plans were developed to link modernization with expansion of the Shore Establishment with the idea in mind that new construction could proceed in a logical manner and efficient facilities would be constructed at a minimum cost.

You are familiar with the broad outlines of the plan with its master jet fields and supporting fields for specialized missions such as carrier-landing practice, gunnery and bombing, and navigation. These complexes, in their turn, are supported by a seaport and industrial station which provide major aircraft overhaul and repair facilities, and in most cases, berths for aircraft carriers.

In addition to the foregoing fleet-support stations, there are stations whose functions provide other essential elements of naval aviation. The training stations which produce new naval aviators and now must provide increasing numbers of jet pilots; research and development stations, which are a part of the essential design, development engineering, test and evaluation process so vital to the forward progress of naval aviation; specialized stations to support the design, development, test and tactical evaluation of new weapons and weapons systems; the Naval Reserve air stations where our aviation Reserve keeps ready; our overseas stations located strategically throughout the world.

The authorization of the Third Marine Air Wing as part of the Navy's air strength has created the need for a permanent base for the home-porting of the groups and squadrons of which this wing is comprised. It is planned to develop the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C., as a permanent base for the Third Marine Air Wing. To that end, $11,096,000 was authorized in fiscal year 1955 for the major initial increment of this development. A second increment of appropriation is requested in this program to continue that development.

So much for the basic plan to expand and modernize the naval aviation shore establishment. Originally, it was estimated that the total cost of the entire modernization and expansion program would be something over a billion dollars, and that the program could be completed within a 4-year period. Ensuing events have caused changes in both estimated costs and times of completion. Interna-

64997—55——7

tional tensions have increased the need for aircraft, aircraft carriers, and shore facilities. The role of naval aviation in continental air defense has been expanded and more clearly defined. The need for more family housing at our stations has been recognized. Costs of construction have risen. Nevertheless, much progress has been made, and though we are just starting in some areas, we are close to completion of the original program in others.

High performance aircraft are supplanting piston-engine aircraft as fast as it is possible to do so. The total operating strength of naval aviation has increased but slightly during the past several years to its present approximately 10,000 aircraft. On the other hand, the number of jet aircraft within this operating strength will rise to an estimated 4,400 by the end of fiscal year 1957. Since many of the facilities requested in the 1956 public works program could not be completed by that time, it can be appreciated that the major portion of this funding program constitutes present-day requirements of naval aviation.

The fiscal year 1956 public works funding program will constitute a substantial and required step forward in providing a modern shore establishment for naval aviation. The objectives to be achieved are outlined briefly as follows:

(1) Continue the development program for major fleet-support stations to insure a high degree of readiness for airgroups and antisubmarine squadrons.

(2) Provide modern airfield facilities in the Naval Air Training Command to provide an annual output of properly trained pilots to the fleet and ultimately to the Naval Reserve. This requirement dictates that two new airfields be developed in the south Texas and Louisiana areas.

(3) Continue the modernization of the Navy's aircraft overhaul and repair establishments.

(4) Undertake a major program for obstruction removal and acquisition of property rights for flight safety and to guard against obsolescence of our plant account.

(5) Provide facilities for the operation of that portion of continental defense and early warning which has been assigned naval aviation.

(6) Continue to develop those facilities required to support the research and development programs of naval aviation.

(7) Provide 1,603 units of family housing in areas in which housing is a critical requirement.

(8) Provide the first funding increment for the construction of a modern airfield to provide flight indoctrination facilities for midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total amount of funds that you have had from the Congress in the past fiscal year for aviation facilities?

Mr. HANABURY. Last year naval aviation received——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I mean in new money.

Mr. HANABURY. In new money approximately $50 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was your carryover that was obligated?

Mr. HANABURY. I will have to ask the Bureau of Yards and Docks to furnish the carryover, sir.

Captain MCHENRY. About 60 percent was obligated.

Mr. Chairman, we will furnish the exact figure for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply a complete recap of the amount of new money that you received, the amount of unexpended and unobligated funds you carried over from the past year that would add to your new money for the present fiscal year, and I want you to delineate what it was expended for and where and by whom. I mean by that, the contracts you issued. It might take you some time to get that information together, but I want it completely available by the time we mark up this bill. We want to know from a committee point of view exactly in detail the expenditures under the Facilities Act.

Captain McHenry, are you from the Bureau of Yards and Docks and responsible for accumulating that information?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

(The information requested may be found on page 367.)

NAVAL AUXILIARY LANDING FIELD, ALICE-ORANGE GROVE AREA, TEXAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the first item that appears in the justifications under "Naval aviation," which is the naval auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove area, Texas, two items, "Taxiway and parking apron" and "Land acquisition and relocation of utilities," wherein your appropriation request for fiscal 1956 is $1,487,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,996,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,487,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,487,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,200,000.

Will you make your presentation for these requirements?

Captain MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am Capt. Eugene B. McKinney, director of staff, Shore Station Development Board, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

The first item is a taxiway and parking apron for which we are requesting $948,000. This taxiway and parking area is needed to provide for rapid clearance of the runway to allow landings due to poor student technique, low fuel, or other emergencies. It is urgently required for jet pilot training.

The second item is land acquisition and relocation of utilities, for which we are requesting $539,000. We are requesting $536,000 for the acquisition of 925 acres of land in fee and $3,000 for drainage easements on 14 acres of private lands. This field has been designated by the Chief of Naval Operations as a field carrier landing practice field, which makes it necessary to acquire land to a distance of 4,000 feet from the ends of the runways to provide proper safety clearance in the approach zones.

The total for the two items is $1,487,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this particular project been engineered, and if so by whom and when?

Captain MCHENRY. It has been engineered within the past 6 months by Mitchell & Hunt of San Antonio, Tex., for $12,000.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, BARIN FIELD, FOLEY, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the naval auxiliary air station, Barin Field, Foley, Ala., wherein your appropriation request is $151,000.

The plant value is $5,964,409; funded construction not in plant value, $50,000; existing unfunded authorization, $157,622; the proposed 1956 authorization, $560,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $560,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,641,000.

Proceed.

Captain MCKINNEY. The request for $151,000 for runway and taxiway lighting is to replace the old flare pots that are presently in use. The flare pots are highly unsatisfactory and unreliable and require men, time, and money and are a hazard even to experienced pilots. For student training we should have the best lighting possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Describe a transformer vault for me, please.

Captain MCHENRY. A transformer vault is a reinforced concrete structure which houses the transformer and provides a safety barrier between the electrically energized parts and people in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this type of installation standard?

Captain MCHENRY. There are inside transformer substations and outdoor transformer substations. Where it is outdoors the station is usually enclosed with a wire fence with proper guards, whereas indoors it is enclosed with a vault which has explosionproof capabilities. It is standard procedure, indoors, to build a vault.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered and if so by whom and when?

Captain MCHENRY. It has been engineered by the public works officer of the Naval Air Basic Command within the past 6 months at Government expense.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, CHASE FIELD, BEEVILLE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item which is the "Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Beeville, Tex.," wherein you are asking for a total appropriation of $1,413,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $3,465,595; funded construction not in plant value, $7,671,400; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,065,500; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,065,500; and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,697,000.

Will you proceed with your justification of these items?

Captain MCKINNEY. The first item is a fueling station, for which we are requesting $284,000. Analysis has proven it is more economical to fuel jet aircraft from these fueling stations than from refueler trucks.

The next item is for an enlisted men's club to provide recreational facilities for approximately 1,700 men, together with their dependents and guests. The presently existing facilities are inadequate and we are requesting $203,000 for an enlisted men's club.

The next item is a chief petty officers' club, for which we are requesting $100,000, to provide adequate recreational facilities for approximately 150 chief petty officers together with their dependents and guests. This is an isolated station and they need these facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And there are no such facilities now?

Captain McKINNEY. No, sir.

The next item is commissioned officers' mess (open), for which we are requesting $307,000, to provide recreational facilities for 525 commissioned officers and officer students together with their dependents and guests. The present facilities consist of a small lounge located in one of the bachelor officer quarters buildings and it is not adequate in size or facilities for the purpose required.

The next item is a supply facility, for which we are requesting $300,000. The present supply facilities are deficient to the extent of about 40,000 square feet. We need this covered space to provide the supply facilities required at this station.

The next item is a lean-to to an existing building to provide a photographic laboratory, for which we are requesting $41,000. This facility will be used for developing gun camera film exposed daily in connection with gunnery training, and because of the nature of these films they cannot readily be processed by commercial companies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have no like facilities there now?

Captain McKINNEY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Take up the next item.

Captain McKINNEY. We are requesting a total of $178,000 for the acquisition of approximately 325 acres of land in fee and 29 acres in drainage easements, plus drainage structures.

The acquisition of the 325 acres in fee is for the construction of the new parallel runway for jet aircraft. Drainage easements are required on an additional 29 acres of off-station property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last March we had a reprograming request submitted to us, acquiesced in by the committee at that time, at Chase Field, and I wonder why the land acquisition was not included in that request. You had a parallel runway of 8,000 feet, $289,000. What has happened that you have the time hiatus in here?

Captain McKINNEY. The city leases a terminal area in the center of this airfield and to remove the interference caused by the city terminal area requires the acquisition of 38 acres adjacent to the station and the conveyance of 27½ acres over to the city.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why was it not in the request at that time?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, I talked to you about the reprograming a few months ago. The answer to your question is that we needed the money to go ahead and prepare the plans and specifications. We need this land to build that runway included in that reprograming request. We have not awarded any contract and we must have the money for the land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is obvious but why did you not ask for it at that time?

Mr. HANABURY. We did not have the authority for land acquisition. We are primarily trying to get authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see. Take up the next item in the justifications, please.

Captain McKINNEY. The next item is family housing for Chase Field, for which we are requesting $540,500.

This is for 2 sets of senior officer quarters, 5 sets of junior officer quarters, and 33 sets of enlisted men's quarters. Private housing in nearby communities is not available in sufficient quantities to supply the needs of this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long has this station been in existence?

Captain McKINNEY. This field was established in 1943. It was disestablished in 1947 and reactivated in 1953.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present cause for the expansion and overhaul of this base to the extent that is reflected in the requests under consideration, and what are you contemplating doing there that you have not done as far as new requirements are concerned? Replacements because of obsolescence and so on, we can understand, but what are the new requirements?

Captain McKINNEY. This is an auxiliary air station. The Naval Air Advance Training Command in South Texas consists of a number of fields, and these items are all related to the increased tempo of training of jet pilots.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is the closest training field of like character?

Captain McKINNEY. This is in the Corpus Christi complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is under the command of Pensacola?

Admiral RUSSELL. No; it is all under Admiral Doyle and the naval advance training is in this area, which is another command.

Captain McKINNEY. The Corpus Christi complex includes Chase, Alice-Orange, Cabaniss, Kingsville, and we are requesting Port Isabel.

Admiral RUSSELL. We have a chart showing the fields in the Corpus Christi complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total mileage separating those bases from minimum to maximum?

Mr. HANABURY. Chase Field is 55 miles from Corpus Christi. Cabaniss is 10 miles from Corpus Christi and it will probably be phased out because this complex was designed for basic trainer propeller-driven type aircraft and now we are in a jet program. At Chase Field the expansion program is primarily because of the transition to the jet program and going from 1,000 to 3,100 pilots per year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Air Force have any bases in that area?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes; Harlingen, Moore, and Laredo; and in the San Antonio area, Kelly, Hondo, Randolph, and Brooks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. OSTERTAG. You made mention of going from 1,000 to how many?

Mr. HANABURY. From about 1,000 in 1950 to 3,100.

Admiral RUSSELL. Per year.

Mr. HANABURY. We are in the 3,100 training now.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That will be your capacity?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir. That is our ultimate peacetime pilot output.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will the capacity of the field meet your full requirements in time of mobilization?

Mr. HANABURY. The mobilization figure will probably not change at that field. We are building it up to its capacity for peacetime.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered and if so by whom and when?

Captain McHENRY. Item 1 was advance planned within the past 6 months. Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 were advance planned by Forrest and Cotton of Dallas, Tex., within the past 6 months for $1,200, $600, $1,800, and $1,800, respectively. Item 6, the lean-to to existing building 1031 for a photographic laboratory, was advance planned by the public-works officer at Corpus Christi.

The housing was not advance planned. The estimates were established by criteria handed to us by higher authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

NAVAL AIR STATION, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, which is the "Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.," wherein you are requesting a total of $664,000, made up of 3 items. I note at this installation the plant value is $55,890,001; funded construction not in plant value, $2,952,000; existing unfunded authorization, $495,236; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,041,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,041,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $25,111,000. Make your presentation.

Captain MCKINNEY. The first item is a radar air-traffic-control center, for which we are requesting $607,000. This facility is required to provide an air-traffic-control system for handling the heavy air traffic, operating at high altitudes and at the high speeds of modern jet aircraft. The existing traffic-control system has a range of only 30 miles and can handle only 1 aircraft at a time for precision approach and landing. Present conditions require a system with a range of 100 miles and the capability of controlling and directing all air traffic within that range.

This facility is also essential to training in pilots' instrument flight operations.

The next item is "Land acquisition," for which we are requesting 92,000. This would provide for the acquisition from the State of 1,731 acres of accreted and submerged land bordering the station along the waterfront. When we dredged the seaplane base the soil was put on submerged land owned by the State of Texas. Improvements were constructed on the accreted lands during World War II. Title to the land is to be acquired from the State of Texas to protect our interests in these improvements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there any contemplated problem in connection with the acquisition of this land?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. The estimated cost will be only $2,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is a building to house an explosive decompression chamber, for which we are requesting $55,000. Equipment to be housed in the building is used to simulate conditions encountered by pilots at high altitudes and to train the pilots in the use of special flight-gear escape procedures, familiarizing them with the sensation of rapid decompression such as occurs when they may be forced to abandon a plane or the cabin loses pressure. It also is required for testing pilots' high altitude flight gear and conduct research on equipment for increasingly higher altitude flight conditions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is nothing new; is it?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. We are trying to establish these at other stations. It is connected with high-altitude flights.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McHenry, have these items been engineered?

Captain McHENRY. They have been, by Lockwood Andrews of Houston, Tex., in the last 6 months, $1,900 and $170, respectively.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All items have been engineered by the same firm?

Captain McHENRY. There are only two items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They were both engineered by the same firm?

Captain McHENRY. They were.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do I understand that under item 2 $2,000 is to be provided for land acquisition?

Captain McKINNEY. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do I read this correctly that there are 1,731 acres?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes. It is accreted land. When we dredged the seaplane base we filled it in and it is owned by the State of Texas.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In its present state it has ho value?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir, because we have several buildings and improvements on it, but the State is willing to let us have it for that nominal price.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You mean you are acquiring 1,731 acres for $2,000?

Captain McKINNEY. In fee; yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is there any special reason for the very nominal price of this land?

Captain McKINNEY. It is just a nominal consideration, Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I take it the State of Texas is willing to deed over to the United States Government this large acreage for a nominal fee in order to have you locate there?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir; and there was a mutual understanding when the land was filled. This really covers title search and drawing up the necessary legal documents.

Captain McHENRY. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I interpret the situation, originally you had a tideland situation there, a marsh situation, in which the title was vested in the State of Texas. In order to put the land in a status of utilization the Navy filled on top of the land but did not change the nature of the land so now you are going to the State and want title in fee?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir; just to clear up the title.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think the record should be clear so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what this $2,000 represents.

NAVAL AIR STATION, GLYNCO, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now pick up the next item, which is the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga., wherein you are requesting $2,232,000 covering six proposals.

The first has to do with a maintenance hangar and parking apron, for which you are requesting $1,299,000. Give us an explanation of all the requirements under that subhead.

I note at this installation the plant value is $12,876,990; funded construction not in plant value, $13,234,000; existing unfunded authorization, $346,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,106,000;

the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,510,600 and the estimated future appropriation required, $17,181,000.

Captain McKINNEY. Until recently this had been a lighter-than-air station and we established the combat intelligence school there for the training of advanced air controllers, and in connection with that training, an 8,000-foot runway was authorized in 1952. We are requesting this maintenance hangar as a facility in connection with the heavier-than-air aircraft. We do have two existing airship hangars there which will continue to be in use. As you will note, the planned capacity for this station in 1957 will be 87 heavier-than-air aircraft and 12 lighter-than-air ships.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One can only conclude from looking at your justifications that a major portion of this item is for stabilization of soil.

Captain McKINNEY. I will ask Captain McHenry to justify that.

Captain McHENRY. That is item b, the parking apron?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. But you are still stabilizing?

Captain McHENRY. That is correct. The subsoil had to be stabilized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item.

Captain McKINNEY. The next item is "Roads, parking areas, walks, and services," for which we are requesting $173,000. This is required in order that the emergency fire, crash, and ambulance equipment can be readily available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On this parking area, I notice it is to be a combination of asphalt and concrete. That is an innovation, is it not?

Captain McKINNEY. That is just for the hangar area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are using concrete, I presume, to get away from spoilage from jet leakage and so on?

Captain McKINNEY. Part of this will be for auto parking as well.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to get at is, is there a line of demarcation between concrete and asphalt and black top. You are not going into asphalt for automobiles?

Admiral CLARK. For trucks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is where you get into your big problem of spoilage from leakage and so on?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. The item includes asphaltic concrete pavement as differentiated from portland cement concrete pavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed with the next item.

Captain McKINNEY. The next item is a public works transportation shop, for which we are requesting a total of $166,000. This item is to provide shop space for a public works garage. The total area required is 12,000 square feet based on the workload of maintaining 284 items of transportation, construction, and aircraft fueling equipment. The present shop space is only about 4,500 square feet, leaving a deficiency of about 8,000 square feet.

The next item is a public works "offices, shop, stores building, and shop facilities," for which we are requesting $248,000. This item includes office space, shop building, and shop stores space for storage of furniture, public works materials, tools, and various equipment which are required to support the maintenance activities. Without these facilities, the public works department cannot properly support station maintenance and operating activities in an efficient manner. The present shops are scattered over a wide area in various buildings

throughout the station, leading to inadequate supervision of employees in the public works department, and loss of time by employees traveling to and from various shops. The shops that will be vacated by reason of the construction of this building will be used for needed warehouse space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you will use all the buildings you will vacate?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it to be assumed that the centralization of this activity will effect certain economies, and if so to approximately what degree? You are certainly not going into this centralization just for doing so.

Captain MCKINNEY. No, Mr. Chairman. This will effect economies in cost and in efficiency of operation. I do not have a figure on that.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In what way?

Captain MCKINNEY. The present shops are scattered and are not suitable for the functions they are performing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the character of the buildings you are vacating? Are they temporary-type structures?

Captain MCHENRY. Temporary frame structures. There are only 4,500 square feet available today against a requirement for 12,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So it is a combination of not only saving time and improving efficiency but supplying additional square footage required?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, plus the cost of maintenance on all these temporary buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course if you will continue using the buildings you will still have to maintain them.

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So there will be no economy there?

Captain MCHENRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go to the next item.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is fuel storage. This was authorized under Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress. This station has no existing jet fuel storage and in July, this month, 30 jet aircraft will be assigned to this station for operational in-training flights in connection with the combat intelligence officers' school, and this jet fuel storage is required for the jet aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We had a report emanating from the General Accounting Office in which they concur in the recommendation you are making now, but they want to go farther than you people apparently are willing to go, unless it has been cut out from the time the budget started to us until the time we received it. They suggest you put a pipeline from the source of your oil to point of delivery. What is wrong with their recommendation?

Mr. HANABURY. It is a fine recommendation and we concur in it. I discussed it with the GAO representative who made the survey and we plan to program it for next year. It is a matter of how much we can expend in 1 year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Why do you wait for the GAO to tell you what is the right thing to do? You have your own advance planning and so on, and why is that not part and parcel of what is the right thing to do rather than having the GAO tell you what you are doing wrong?

Mr. HANABURY. I do not think they are telling us what we are doing wrong. We have made an exhaustive study of our fields and in many instances we have put in pipeline up to 20 miles where economies are effected. In Miramar we did it. One reason we have not programed it so far for this station is that our operations down there are not intensive yet. We concur wholeheartedly with the GAO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They say here that the use of a pipeline would result in an annual saving of $104,800 in transportation cost, or sufficient to amortize the cost of the pipeline facilities in approximately 28 months. Of course all the policy this committee has been exposed to has been indicative of the fact that the first consideration is economy. So here apparently we have not caught up with the economic appeal, if I may use that terminology.

Captain MCHENRY. The advance planning for this station envisions the pipeline. We are requesting $2,232,000 for the present increment. This shows $17 million for a subsequent development. That pipeline will be one of those increments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I gather the reason it is not in here is based on the fact the Navy feels you want to create the usability and put in the pipeline at that time; is that right?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume next year we will be confronted with this request. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, it is.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item.

Captain MCKINNEY. We have a request for family housing at this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is in the amount of $1,058,600?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

Captain MCKINNEY. This item is to provide 13 junior officer quarters and 67 enlisted men's quarters. Family housing is urgently needed for military personnel at this station. The need for housing is critical due to the scheduled opening of the combat information and air controller school this year. This is a first increment of the total housing requirement. You will note this was authorized under Public Law 765 of the 83d Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are advancing your family housing constructionwise to take care of the on-board requirements?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your lapse or void in your family housing requirements presently on this base?

Captain MCFARLAND. We now have 2 permanet officer quarters on this base and we have community support of 122 units; 53 officer units and 69 enlisted-men units. There is a gross requirement of 282 officer units and 93 enlisted units and a net requirement of 237 officer units and 524 enlisted that are not now met. The request is for 13 officer units and 67 enlisted-men units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that mean you are short 761 units?

Captain MCFARLAND. That is right. This is the first increment of the continuing program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I figure it, that will still leave you short 681.

Captain MCFARLAND. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call your attention to certain excerpts from our report on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1955, and I quote:

> The cost estimates presented to the committee by the Department on these type facilities were in many instances considerably higher than similar costs in the Air Force. With this restudy in mind the committee has deleted requests for certain common-type facilities. At naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla., the parachute building and ordnance facilities have been denied. Fuel-storage facilities at the naval auxiliary air station, Glynco, Ga., at the naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex., and the Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C., have also been deleted.

Fire and crash stations at (listing a number of stations) "have been denied" and "ammunition storage facilities" at certain stations listed here "have been denied for the same reason."

What, if anything, as a result of the committee's comment in that report, has been done in compliance with the suggestions therein, as applied to your budget?

Captain MCHENRY. There was one item at Glynco, Ga., fuel-storage facilities, that was denied on the ground the Air Force figure was considerably lower. A review of the aviation fuel-storage item indicates the Air Force items were for above-ground storage in larger tanks. The fuel-storage items denied were in all cases for underground storage. Placing them underground is more costly than above ground and the Navy's policy of fuel storage underground is supported by the Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, this naval air station, and I take it most of your naval air stations, are built and maintained to support the fleet and general naval operations?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir. This is classified as a training station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. For that reason it is practical to have it in some strategic location along the coastline?

Admiral RUSSELL. It is located at Glynco primarily because of air traffic conditions. This involves the control of fighters in the air and it is difficult to find locations anywhere for this purpose.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In connection with this project there is no land acquisition involved; is that correct?

Admiral RUSSELL. I believe not. We are leasing a total of thirty-four-thousand-odd acres. We do have easements for approaches to the field. I believe we need title to land or an avigation easement for the elimination of obstructions to the flight path.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I have been glancing through your statement which gives the total amount of money involved in this program, but the thought occurred to me that there is no way of telling how this expansion program looks by way of total land acquisition and the abandonment, if any, of facilities here in the United States.

Admiral CLARK. We will come to that item all grouped together and explain each station, what generated the requirement, how much we will take in fee, how much in avigation easements, and we have a movie that shows the need for introducing this avigation easement problem this year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, will it show the picture in a package?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How much we are expanding, what it will amount to, what we have and what we are abandoning for some reason or another?

Admiral CLARK. It will show you both as a package and the items detailed geographically.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Captain MCKINNEY. In addition, we have supplied a list of the proposed land acquisition and avigation clearance and it is already a part of the record.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that in the record?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I have no further questions on this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One closing question Captain McHenry, have all these increments been engineered?

Captain MCHENRY. Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been engineered by Patchen & Zimmerman, of Augusta, Ga., within the past 6 months for $10,300. Item 5 was engineered by Robert & Co., of Atlanta, Ga., for $3,000. The family housing was not engineered. The estimates were established by criteria prepared by the Department of Defense.

NAVAL AIR STATION, HUTCHINSON, KANS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval air station, Hutchinson, Kans.," wherein you are requesting $81,000 for replacement of a steam distribution system. I note at this installation the plant value is $16,028,419; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $81,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $81,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $4,847,000. Will you explain this item, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. The existing steam distribution system was installed over 12 years ago. Because of lack of maintenance during the period 1946 to 1952, adverse soil conditions, and poor material, the system has become badly corroded. Leaks in the lines are so numerous that it is impossible to maintain operating pressures. Maintenance of the lines is a continuous and expensive operation. This item is for replacement of approximately 4,500 linear feet of the existing underground system with new aboveground lines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words replacement is necessary because of the length of time that the lines have been underground and the leakage that has developed, and to save the steam.

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was determined by your engineering people that it is advisable to renew the entire system?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered?

Captain MCHENRY. It has been engineered by the Capital Engineering Co., of Topeka, Kans., within the last 6 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we do have a $25,000 contractual availability under post commands, do we not?

Captain MCHENRY. Subject to approval of the Chief of the Management Bureau; yes, sir, when it involves new construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Beyond $25,000; no.

Captain MCHENRY. Beyond $25,000, the Congress may see it. If a project is determined to be urgently required in the interest of national defense, it may be funded by annual maintenance and operations appropriations. Such projects may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy in amounts up to $50,000, and by the Secretary of Defense up to $200,000. If it can be foreseen in time to be included in a public works program and we can accept the delay, the criteria require its inclusion in the public works program. The authority to do this is included in the general provisions of the annual appropriations acts for the military services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that is strictly adhered to?

Captain MCHENRY. Here is a specific example, sir; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course that is what I expect to find out when I get the report that I asked for.

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This plant, according to the justifications, is valued at $16 million, plus, and this repair or replacement of the steam plant amounts to $81,000. However, in your estimated future appropriation required, you are pointing out the need for an additional $4,847,000. What would be the nature of that additional requirement?

Major FENTON. We have replacement of steam systems in various buildings, supply warehouse, replacement of cold storage building, motor pool building, replacement of old temporary building, aviation storage and distribution, and 110 sets of quarters, administration building, enlisted men's club, chapel and aviation hangar.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that programed for some future time, or is that just your estimate for some years in the future?

Major FENTON. That is the estimate for the future. Part of it will be in the 1957 program, and the remainder in 1958.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But there is no timetable?

Major FENTON. Yes, sir; the next 2 years.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex., in which 10 requirements are expressed totaling $3,951,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $18,458,471; funded construction not in plant value, $5,982,000; existing unfunded authorization, $265,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,955,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,220,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $9,548,000.

Pick up the first item reflected as "Aircraft maintenance hangar" and present the justification for that request.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is for the first increment, for a total of $1,358,000. This provides a modern aircraft maintenance hangar to get the repair work which is presently being done outdoors and subjected to the weather, dust, and such, under cover. The existing five wooden hangars are not sufficient to handle the existing load there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the old hangars; are you going to move them, utilize them, and what is considered their present value?

Admiral RUSSELL. They will be used.

Mr. HANABURY. I can only give you a rough estimate. The estimated total value of the hangars there now is about $1.2 million. Of course they were built in 1942 and 1943.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you consider they are entirely an 18 to 20 percent writeoff?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir, I certainly would.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see the next heavy item that appears under this is concrete apron, $180,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. That is the apron around the maintenance hangar where the planes are parked prior to the time they are hauled inside for repair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Control tower," where you are asking for $134,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is for the south field and this is to replace the existing control tower which is a four-story wooden structure in very poor condition. The station has attempted to patch it up from time to time, to steady it with guy wires, but it is in such bad condition they are afraid it will fall down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not have to explain it. I have been on the base and seen it and it should have been replaced long ago.

Pick up the next item 3, "Parachute loft," where you are asking for $126,000. Give us the explanation for that, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. The former loft was burned down in 1952 and now we have no parachute loft on this station. The parachutes are presently transported to Corpus Christi, which is a very costly and time-consuming procedure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Radar air traffic control center," where you want $392,000. What is the explanation for this item?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is to control heavy air traffic and is the same as the traffic control center previously explained under "Corpus Christi."

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is comparable with the others in the requirements?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Give us the explanation for the bachelor officers' quarters and mess, for which you are asking for $737,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. This station has a planned load of 269 officers and 418 officer students. The existing capacity is 208 in 4 temporary BOQ's, and this will leave a deficiency still of 82 officers and officer students.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you addressing yourself to item No. 5?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir; the BOQ and mess.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many officers, did you say?

Captain MCKINNEY. The planned load is 260 officers and 418 officer students.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item, is "Commissioned officers' mess, open," for which we are requesting $328,000. The existing open mess consists of a small area in one of the subsistence buildings, which is entirely inadequate under the criteria established by the Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Supply warehouse," where you are asking for $236,000. Why is this structure required?

Captain MCKINNEY. The existing space is in 2 wooden structures built in 1942 and comprise about 10,000 square feet. This new warehouse is necessary to relieve the deficiency in storage space at this station. Storage space is required to maintain a 90-day stock level of aviation supplies and general stores. There is an existing deficiency of 30,000 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That means you want a total of 41,000 square feet; is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Public works garage," where you are asking for $269,000. Why do you need it?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is a public works garage and service station, and includes moving two 10,000-gallon gasoline storage tanks from the present location to the new service station. The garage is required to maintain and service 260 vehicles presently on this station and 130 pieces of equipment consisting of standard vehicles such as trucks, cargo trailers, buses, and passenger vehicles. The remainder are specialized-type vehicles required for support of airfield operations and maintenance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have located this building where you have to put additional roads and other additional attributes to utilize the building; it is not replacing another building where you already have the roads and utilities in there?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. There is an existing garage of about 8,000 square feet which will be used for a public works storage building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I meant in carrying access roads and utilities over to the new building. Notwithstanding it may be a part of the total involved, my assumption was if you are going to enlarge the present garage, obviously you would have some of those public utilities there. This is practically an extension and is to go onto the other, where the new stock will be arranged. Is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. The proposed garage will be constructed at a new location in accordance with the master plan of the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Land acquisition," for which you are asking a total of $106,000. This is an old established station, is it not?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need new land?

Captain MCKINNEY. There are two fields here. The 95-acre and 232-acre parcels, more or less, are for acquisition in fee. The other portions of the item are for drainage easements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, for North Field you want 95.54 acres and for South Field you want 232.4 acres.

Captain MCKINNEY. In fee; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now the proximity is what?

Mr. HANABURY. They are 3 miles apart.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was intended to point out that for the 95 acres you have an estimated cost of $209 per acre and, for the 232 acres, you have an estimated cost of $335 per acre. What is the difference?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The type of soil is superior at the more expensive area. The prices have been based on a preliminary appraisal furnished by Mr. J. A. Baker of Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you viewed this land yourself?

Mr. TIENCKEN. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anybody here who has?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir; I have viewed it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Tell me what the difference is in the structural aspect in the vicinity of the land, between the land at the North Field and the land at the South Field, agriculturally, and so forth.

Mr. HANABURY. The North Field is really encroaching a little bit on the King Ranch and drops off into a real gully and approaches wasteland. It looks like good duck-hunting ground. At the South Field there are improvements around it and the land is under cultivation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, would you attribute the difference between the two figures to the building, rather than the actual soil difference?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; I would say it was a combination of both.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I noticed you referred to that land as having a duck potential. When were you there?

Mr. HANABURY. I was there in July of 1953.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you see any ducks at that time?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Neither did I at a much later date; but I will accept your statement.

Captain MCKINNEY. I might add that this land is for construction of a new parallel runway previously authorized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This was authorized in the program request referred to some few minutes ago; yet you considered it advisable not to go ahead with the reprograming under that authorization you had at that time, as against presenting it at this time; is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is jet fuel storage, where you are making a request for $265,000. Please present your requirements for that money.

Captain MCKINNEY. This item was previously authorized under Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress and is required to provide sufficient jet-fuel storage to support the expanded jet pilot training schedule at this station. The existing jet-fuel storage of 27,000 barrels is sufficient for approximately only 6 days' operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the relation to this program or appraisal as against the reprograming request of last March when it was reflected as being a fueling station of bombers, $480,000?

Mr. HANABURY. Those were fueling stations where we actually drive the aircraft up to the gas pump.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, they are distinctly different stations and for different support?

Mr. HANABURY. That is exactly it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions pertaining to this item?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Taking the last item first, the fuel-storage item, why is there a difference in unit cost in this whole operation of fuel storage? I note under this project the unit cost is $8.60 and turning back to the Georgia project the unit cost is $9.40. There must be some reason, and I am wondering why.

Captain MCHENRY. The specific reason I cannot tell you. I can tell you this, however, that each of these projects as applied to the

individual stations has been completely engineered by professional engineers and this is their estimate established on an engineering basis. I can give you the items that enter into it, not by unit price, but by total.

Admiral CLARK. I believe, Captain McHenry, this particular difference stems from the different size of the underground tanks. These are 13,500 gallon and I believe the others were smaller tanks and there were more of them.

Captain MCKINNEY. There were five in the other.

Admiral CLARK. And it will probably be affected by the terrain or usage.

Captain MCHENRY. The Glynco item was for two 5,000-barrel tanks, and this item is for two 13,500-barrel tanks. The larger tank is cheaper per barrel.

Admiral CLARK. It is cheaper by the dozen.

Commander MALEY. The actual cost of the tankage at Kingsville for 13,500 barrels is estimated at $4 per barrel. The rest of the money that goes to make up the unit price of $8.60 a barrel that you see before you include the foundations and all of the auxiliary equipment that goes to make a complete and usable facility.

In the tankage for Glynco, the unit price included many of these same items. However, the basic price for tankage for 5,000-barrel tanks at Glynco runs a little higher—about $5.50 per barrel for the smaller tanks, as against $4 for the larger tanks at Kingsville.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In all of these naval air station projects, I assume you have facilities now for storage where these stations are already in existence, do you not?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. I have a breakdown of that, if you would like it, of the necessity and the differential under the required program.

Admiral CLARK. In phasing in more jets, we need more storage.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I understand that. What I was getting at is that these items and these amounts are a supplementation of existing facilities.

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir; that is right. The required jet-fuel storage is approximately 48,000 barrels; the required aviation-gas storage is about 10,000. The existing is about 34,000 for jets and 7,000 for aviation gas, leaving a combined total deficiency in barrels of about 17,000 barrels for this station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I know you have an answer to this question, but I want to raise it to clear up in my own mind and perhaps that of others who might have given some thought to the practical application and utilization of centralized storage and centralized distribution, let us say, of aviation fuel: You have a number of naval air stations, and the Air Force has, and the Army might have operations, let us say, in Texas, and we know there are many. Is it a practical matter to have a central storage and pipelines and distribution to our several facilities there, or is it more practical from the standpoint of hazard, from the standpoint of utilization and efficiency, to have these storage facilities in each of the stations?

Admiral CLARK. First, from a dispersal point of view, it would be very bad to have too many of our stores combined so that one bomb would knock out a whole series of field support. In other words, if

you were hit by a bomb on a big centralized support area, then you would dry up your supply for a whole combat.

As to business management and actual operational advantages, I think perhaps Admiral Russell or Mr. Hanabury could explain.

Mr. HANABURY. I mentioned to you sometime ago we have made an exhaustive pipeline study and are doing just what you suggest on the west coast at one of our major stations, El Toro. We have a pipeline that we use for several Air Force bases on the west coast and tie it in to a place called Norwalk, Calif. The management aspects and operation of it we are looking into now. It is just being completed. Another place is in north Africa at the Port Lyautey Base, where we tie it into the Air Force system. Any place where it looks like it is feasible to do it, we do it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. After you have already set up all of these stations with their own support there, then you are going to give consideration to centralizing and abandoning what is already constructed?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir. What I am referring to is strictly the on-station support. We have the problem of getting the fuel from the refinery to the bulk storage plant, the ready-issue plant of the station and to the fuel station, and then into the aircraft.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You are talking about distribution and transportation, rather than storage, are you not?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That answers my question.

Now on this whole question of facilities and properties, I take it from the justifications here there are 3,087 acres involved in this station, in addition to a request for land acquisition totaling probably three or four hundred more acres. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This additional land acquisition is primarily for the purpose of providing an area sufficient for jet operation?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is correct, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The safety aspect of the operation.

Admiral RUSSELL. The safety aspect, and the operation of jets consumes so much fuel, it has such a short endurance in the air, that normally we have to put a parallel runway so that we can bring the jet down immediately it gets in the vicinity of the field.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In the acquisition of this land, as I understand it from your response to the chairman, you are guided entirely by private appraisals; is that correct? Did I understand that from your response to the chairman?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir. We employ private local appraisers at each individual area to ascertain the value and we purchase according to those appraisal reports. Those reports, however, are reviewed by our own appraisers who determine that they are completely supported and the prices are the going prices in that particular area. If we are unable to negotiate, then the property is acquired through condemnation and those local appraisers become the United States witnesses in the condemnation proceedings instituted by the Department of Justice.

Mr. OSTERTAG. On the theory that 2 appraisals or 2 heads are better than 1, I take it your appraisers check the local appraisers. Now if your appraisers are good enough to pass judgment on the private appraisers, why do you need private appraisers in the first place?

Mr. TIENCKEN. If we had to go into condemnation, it is preferable to have local witnesses rather than Government witnesses from a distant locality. I might also say we do not have a staff of Government appraisers.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will you explain what is meant by this reference in your justification, where it indicates the total acreage and says "does not include avigation easements on 1,016 acres."

Mr. TIENCKEN. The avigation easement program was entirely separate and was put into a later item which is the last item in the volume.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It appears later in the bill.

Captain MCHENRY. This merely points out there is another item of land acquisition at this station. That item which you read will appear as an item under a total avigation easements program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. One more point I would like to clear up. This is an expansion program. I interpret, generally speaking, you have a present strength of officers and enlisted men and civilians and this exceeds, your planned number, the officers and students you have.

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Here you are expanding a facility and yet your planned program so far as students and personnel is concerned will be diminished in some cases?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I should not say "diminished"; I should say "lessened."

Admiral RUSSELL. We are asking for an additional whole base for training jets, which will come later on.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The total plant value is shown in your justifications as approximately $18.5 million and this program calls for an expenditure of $3.9 million, but your estimated future requirements amount to $9.5 million, which is 50 percent of the total value of the station now.

Could you give us a rundown as to your programing and what that might involve in the large items?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I do not mean a lot of details, but what are the major requirements.

Mr. HANABURY. May I answer the question in this manner, first? This field was built originally for training, propeller-driven-type aircraft in 1942 or 1943. Its replacement cost today would probably be 2½ to 3 times; but the big reason for the increase is the change in the types of aircraft, from the propeller driven to jet, and to accommodate that we have to do considerable expansion, for instance, of our fuel facilities, runways, and so forth.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, we did not look ahead to this sort of thing?

Mr. HANABURY. We looked ahead as far as we dared, but our public works appropriations in the past 2 or 3 years have not been large.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At that time, under the requirements you were training in a field of mechanical devices completely different from the present training; so when you come up to the present planned requirement you have your option either to go out and rehabilitate this place wherein the taxpayers already have an investment, or to go someplace

else, if you could find one of like character and rehabilitate, or to build a new one?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is not that literally the picture?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. HANABURY. And we selected the base which was in the Corpus Christi area for expansion. For instance, the other smaller ones we had to discard, because they are too close to meet the airspace requirements.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How urgent is this project estimate of $9.5 million for future requirements? That is what I am trying to get at. After all, here we are providing $3.5 million, but you say $9.5 million is going to be required. When, and how urgent is it?

Mr. HANABURY. I would say that would be a 2-year program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And it is primarily based on modernization and your needs for training in connection with modern aviation?

Mr. HANABURY. And some replacement in it, sir.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn.," wherein you are making a request for $759,000 for the purpose of water supply storage facilities and improvement of central heating plant.

I note at this installation the plant value is $39,716,771; funded construction not in plant value, $1,595,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $784,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $784,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $50,636,000.

Present your justifications for this item, please.

Captain McKINNEY. The first item, for $183,000, provides a 500,000-gallon water storage reservoir with connecting mains and pumping equipment. The present capacity is less than half of the amount established as the minimum requirement of at least one-half the total daily consumption of 2,500,000 gallons per day. The need for this facility has been cited consistently by the Navy Inspector General's Office as an urgent requirement necessary to the safety of this station.

With reference to the Kingsville, Tex., requirement, has it been engineered?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By whom and when?

Captain McHENRY. It was engineered by Forrest & Cotton, of Dallas, Tex., within the past 6 months.

(The following was subsequently supplied:)

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

Aircraft maintenance hangar: Advance plans Forrest & Cotton, Dallas, Tex., $5,000.

Control tower: DPWO–8ND.

Parachute loft: Advance plans, Forrest & Cotton, Dallas, Tex.; $1,500.

Radar air traffic control center: Detail plans, T. E. Duce Association, Tex.; $8,000.

Bachelor officers quarters and mess: Detail plans, N. W. Hardy, Wade Gibson Association, Texas.; $17,900.

Commissioned officer mess: $11,600.
Supply warehouse: DPWO–8ND.
Public works garage: Brock & Anderson, Corpus Christi, Tex.; $9,000; detail plans.
Land acquisition: DPWO–8ND.
Fuel storage: PWO, NAATC, NAS Corpus Christi, Tex.

Captain McKINNEY. For the improvement of the central heating plant, we are requesting $576,000. This provides for increasing the capacity of the central heating plant to supply the additional heating load resulting from new construction during the last 4 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the project at Memphis, Tenn.?

Has this been engineered, Captain; if so, by whom?

Captain McHENRY. These two projects were engineered by Allen & Hoshell of Memphis, Tenn., within the past 6 months for a total of $5,750.

NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is that of the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., containing 8 subdivisions for a total of $3,453,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $47,657,520; funded construction not in plant value, $23,803,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $6,007,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $6,007,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $57,795,000.

Pick up the first item "Radar air traffic control center," for which you are asking $308,000, and present the justification for that.

Captain McKINNEY. For that item, we are requesting $308,000. This is to replace the present mobile ground-controlled approach system. We have previously described a similar item at Corpus Christi and Kingsville.

(The following was submitted later:)

The increased density of air traffic in this area, coupled with the advent of high performance, high speed aircraft, has made the existing installation obsolete. Completion of the center will permit the station to control and accept air traffic under instrument flying conditions commensurate with the requirements of modern-day operations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have an estimated future appropriation required of $57,795,000. What is anticipated under that request?

Mr. HANABURY. The principal item is a new overhaul and repair department at Pensacola, totaling $34 million of that total amount, and the others consist of an additional new control tower system, other improvements to the station, including distribution system, modification of the steam piping system, cathodic protection of piers and elevated water tanks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much?

Mr. HANABURY. For the last item?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. HANABURY. $47,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the next?

Mr. HANABURY. Married enlisted men's quarters; married officers' quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much?

Mr. HANABURY. On the married quarters, $1,082,000. Public works center, $1,865,000; paint, oil and varnish storehouse, $1,918,000.

I have a long list which I can furnish for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Suppose you supply that for the record.
Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.
(The information is as follows:)

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.

Project title	*Amount*
1. Steam disbribution system	$767, 000
2. Modification to steam piping systems, new powerplant	51, 000
3. OLF Western No. 1	1, 460, 000
4. ALF Ellyson, additional field lighting	71, 000
5. Forrest Sherman Field, avigation easements	206, 000
6. Avigation easements, OLF Blackwater A	2, 000
7. Addition to cadet recreation club	163, 000
8. Telephone exchange and related facilities	673, 000
9. Forrest Sherman Field, wind erosion control	185, 000
10. New powerplant, third increment	1, 650, 000
11. Forrest Sherman Field, runway development	1, 072, 000
12. Dental clinic	359, 000
13. Bachelor Officers' Quarters (2 400-man)	3, 004, 000
14. Forrest Sherman Field, west gate house	40, 000
15. Forrest Sherman Field, additional AvGas fuel facilities	700, 000
16. New overhaul and repair facilities	34, 758, 000
17. Alterations to building 45	58, 000
18. Cathodic protection, piers and elevated water tanks	47, 000
19. Married enlisted men's quarters (124 units)	2, 643, 000
20. Married officers' quarters (50 units)	1, 082, 000
21. Enlisted men's barracks	818, 000
22. Chapel (600 men)	181, 000
23. Drill hall and physical training center	1, 174, 000
24. Public works center	1, 865, 000
25. Paint, oil, and varnish storehouse	1, 918, 000
26. Small Field, OLF Blackwater B (SOD)	147, 000
27. Public works utility building and warehouse	203, 000
28. Railroad bridge	433, 000
29. Air-conditioning building 625	170, 000
30. Fire protection devices (16 buildings)	131, 000
31. Avigation easements, OLF Blackwater B	380, 000
32. Mezzanine, building 604	191, 000
33. Survival training unit	296, 000
34. Alterations, building 603	90, 000
35. Addition to building 680	184, 000
36. Air-conditioning building 626	25, 000
37. Addition to building 714	285, 000
38. ALF Ellyson construct automotive maintenance shop	81, 000
39. ALF Ellyson construct fire station	158, 000
40. ALF Ellyson construct senior MOQ	74, 000
Total	57, 795, 000

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Subsistence building," in the amount of $407,000. Present the justification for that, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. This will provide a subsistence building with the capacity for one thousand personnel. There will be about 1,200 enlisted men and 500 cadets who will be operating from Forrest Sherman Field, which is about 2½ miles from the main station at Pensacola. They are housed at the main station, but take their noon meal at Forrest Sherman Field. This will eliminate transportation and unnecessary delay in carrying them back and forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item reflecting a request for $1,091,000 for aircraft parking area and access roads. Make your justification for that, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. This provides for a paved aircraft parking area, connecting taxiway with drainage and lighting facilities. This provides in part for a parking area and taxiway to an existing field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that at the station, or at Forrest Sherman Field—which of the two locations?

Captain MCKINNEY. At Forrest Sherman Field.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 4. Aviation fuel truck fill stand, $99,000.—This item provides a four-place aviation truck fill stand for simultaneous loading of aviation gasoline and jet fuel.

Item 5.—New overhaul and repair facility for which we are requesting $1,336,000 for the preparation of plans and specifications for the new overhaul and repair facility at Forrest Sherman Field, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. The magnitude of this project requires 1 year lead time for this preliminary work. This station activity which overhauls, repairs and maintains a majority of the 4,000 aircraft assigned to the Training Command and in particular the 1,500 operating aircraft of the Basic Training Command is at present accomplishing the work in 70 assorted nonindustrial type buildings scattered over 987 acres as distant as 3½ miles. The new project includes three major buildings with a total area of 1,088,760 square feet. With this new centralized overhaul plant, an estimated saving of over $3½ million a year can be effected over the present overhaul costs, thus the new plant, which will cost about $35 million would be amortized in less than 10 years. The existing shop buildings comprising about 600,000 square feet will be available for fulfilling urgent and essential station space requirements of a nonindustrial nature.

STATEMENT ON REQUIREMENT FOR NEW OVERHAUL AND REPAIR FACILITIES AT NAS, PENSACOLA, FLA.

The erection of a modern industrial facility at Forrest Sherman Field to house the overhaul and repair department of NAS Pensacola is imperative if more efficient and economical support of the naval aviation training program is to be accomplished. This facility must be of such size that the various processes of overhaul, repair, and maintenance will be contained in one closely integrated plant. The facility should be completed, occupied, and in full production not later than 1958 if the full benefits of savings are to be gained. This time schedule makes it a definite must to contract for the design and engineering of the facility with fiscal 1956 funds, with the actual construction contract being made with fiscal 1957 funds. This time schedule places this project in the urgent category.

The industrial activity for the overhaul, repair, and maintenance of the majority of the 4,000 aircraft assigned to the Training Command, and in particular of the 1,500 operating aircraft in the Basic Training Command (this is one-sixth of the total operation aircraft in the Navy), is presently located in 70 assorted buildings at NAS Pensacola. The majority of these buildings were built for nonindustrial uses, such as barracks, coke bins, sand bins, water reservoir, riding stable, wooden ship sawmills. One was the first hangar use for erection of naval aircraft. These buildings are totally unsuited for present-day production methods. They are scattered over 987 acres, and the distance between them is as great as 3½ miles. Several of the larger buildings are of the World War II temporary construction and, because of deterioration, modification, and change, they are no longer economically feasible to use for efficient productive work. Chevalier Field about which the overhaul and repair buildings are located, is totally unsuited for use by modern aircraft due to extremely short runways. That these runways are impractical to lengthen has been recognized by the construction of Forrest Sherman Field at a location approximately 3 miles distant. In 1951, when the basic plans for Forrest Sherman Field were made, the requested O. and R. facilities were included and the basic engineering layout and study made. Now that Forrest Sherman Field is nearing completion and the imminent closing of Chevalier Field is at hand, an essential priority for the overhaul and repair facilities is necessary. When consideration is given to cost of towing aircraft, the great distance between the present location of the overhaul and repair department and Forrest Sherman Field for each test flight, and for the delivery and acceptance of aircraft, and also the inherently uneconomical physical layout of the present plant and its resulting inefficiencies, the essential classification for this project is justified. The timing in requesting A. and E. funds in 1956 and construction in 1957 is not only coupled with the move of operations to Forrest Sherman Field, but is also logically tied in with the industrial changeover from the older type planes which are being phased out to the modern-type planes which are entering the program. Certain new machinery and equipment are being furnished for the overhaul and repair of the new components. In many cases this equipment will require major

modifications to existing structures in the old plant. In some cases, the building of new structures will be required to house the equipment. Both of these expenditures would be eliminated by the new facility. The installation of modern industrial techniques together with the corresponding economies, requires flow lines and closely integrated shops, both of which are impossible to achieve to any significant degree under present conditions.

The incongruous use of structures designed and erected for building wooden ships or other primitive uses obviously denotes inefficiency. Manpower, in the days of the layout of the present plant, was one of the cheapest commodities. Labor now being the most expensive commodity, modern industrial practices and their related facilities are indispensable. In order to provide the best trained aviator to the fleet, efficient fast overhaul, repair, and maintenance must be furnished to get the maximum flight time and utilization of aircraft. This fast, efficient overhaul and repair at the center of this highly concentrated training area could reduce the pipeline and the number of aircraft required, thereby making more aircraft available for the operating commands.

The project will include 3 major buildings with a total area of 1,088,760 square feet. The adjacent surfacing work, aircraft parking areas, roads, utilities, and services will interconnect with the rest of the naval air station. Industrial machines and equipment are to be moved from the present plant, which cost is included in the project.

The construction of this facility is the only economical method of meeting the station's requirements. The only alternate is to use the old facility, which would require additional new construction from time to time in the next 10 years to meet requirements for overhaul and repair of new type aircraft, a heavy-duty taxi strip from the present facilities to Forrest Sherman Field, and the uneconomical repair and maintenance of Chevalier Field which is presently planned to be closed. This would also require construction of new facilities for other station and command activities, all of which results in expenditure of facilities and moneys with no gains in efficiency.

This project was first conceived in 1951 with the development of Forrest Sherman Field. It has now reached the stage where funding is imperative to achieve the Department of Defense aims of saving appropriated funds both in facilities, and by economical and efficient operation. Unless approval of the project as a whole and full funding for architectural and engineering services in 1956 with the full funding of the facilities in 1957 is made, gross loss of the proposed savings stated as follows will occur.

Annual savings:

Annual savings to be gained by use of a new modern O. and R. plant for first 10 years of its operation based on present and current planned workloads.

Direct labor on aircraft	$1,021,870
Direct labor on aeronautical spares and manufacturing parts	150,480
Overhead (on all operations)	140,000
Material (aircraft and aeronautical parts)	1,123,060
Transportation	237,880
Maintenance, repair utilities	450,000
Modernization	213,460
Tow operation for aircraft from present to new field	108,250
Shop stores	97,230
Tool cribs	18,900
Total yearly savings	3,561,130

Based on an estimated installation cost of $34,757,508 and an indicated annual saving of $3,561,130 over present operation costs, recovery of capital investment equals $\frac{\$34,757,508}{3,561,130} = 9.76$ years.

It is not anticipated that major increases or reductions in the training program will be made as long as the fleet operations remain near current levels and a Naval Reserve program is maintained. If a 20-percent reduction in the total aviation training program were made after 5 years of operation of the new plant, the annual savings would be reduced 12 percent, which would still pay off the investment in a total of 10.6 years. In case of a war, the new facility would pay for itself many times over in savings of both manpower and money as well as in materials. The funding request for the fiscal year 1956 for this project is $1,336,000, the balance of the funds for construction will be requested in the Navy fiscal year 1957 public works program.

Item 6. Addition to house, human disorientation device, $104,000.—A human disorientation device is currently scheduled for delivery to the school of Aviation Medicine, NAS, Pensacola, in January 1955, at an estimated cost of $500,000. However, to date funds have not been provided for facilities to house the equipment when delivered. This item will provide the required house for equipment that will test pilot behavior under operating conditions.

Item 7. Bore sighting target range (500 feet) 1 position, $65,000.—This provides for the construction of one boresighting range for periodic checking of aircraft gunsights, in which the bores of the guns are alined with the gunsights to insure that the guns shoot where the pilot aims. This is required for effective basic gunnery training of naval pilots.

Item 8. Ready ammunition lockers, $43,000.—This will provide six earth-cover ready ammunition lockers with access roads in the vicinity of Forrest Sherman Field in compliance with current safety regulations to furnish ready-service ammunition during the gunnery phase of the pilot training program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the advanced engineering at Pensacola?

Captain MCHENRY. The following is in explanation of advanced engineering:

Radar air traffic control center: B. O. Vannort Engineers, Inc., Charlotte, N. C., $2,290.

Subsistence building: Officer in charge, naval air basic training, Pensacola.

Aircraft parking area: J. B. Converse & Co., Inc., Mobile, Ala., $6,400 estimated.

Aviation fuel truck fill stand: Officer in charge, Naval Air Basic Training Command.

Addition to house disorientation device: DeLaureal & Moses & A. Alexander, Pensacola, Fla., $800.

Boresighting target: J. B. Converse & Co., Inc., Mobile, Ala., $400 estimated,

Ready ammunition lockers: J. B. Converse & Co., Inc., Mobile, Ala., $500 estimated.

Overhaul and repair facility aircraft and engineering: Wallace Clark & Co., New York City, $57,250.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, PORT ISABEL, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval auxiliary air station, Port Isabel, Tex.," composed of 13 items totaling $5,544,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $5,606,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $5,606,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,200,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. Port Isabel is a new auxiliary air station about 120 miles south of Corpus Christi Field, which is the headquarters for the Naval Advanced Air Training Command. This new field is required to provide the facilities necessary to train jet pilots under our expanded aviation training program. The mission of this new station provides for facilities to support the staging of the gunnery phase of the jet pilot training syllabus. The Navy proposes to take over the old Army Air Force installation at Port Isabel and convert it to present day requirements. Since this is a new facility the justification for each item is on the basis of original need, except as to where some items can be made available by modification or renewal of existing facilities. I will enumerate each of the basic items which are required to activate the new station with the estimated cost of each item:

Item	
1. Operation and administration building	$169,000
2. Control tower	155,000
3. Barracks and subsistence building	380,000
4. Fuel storage and unloading facility	348,000
5. Ordnance facilities	195,000
6. Outdoor recreation facilities	27,000
7. Rehabilitation of roads	60,000
8. Perimeter fence	25,000
9. Navy exchange	89,000
10. Rehabilitation of hangar	152,000
11. Runway, taxiway, and parking apron, paving, drainage, and lighting	3,391,000
12. Utilities	450,000
13. Land acquisition and relocation of highways and utilities	103,000

The advanced training command has been assigned a firm mission to train 3,200 pilots annually, over 1,400 of which must be jet pilots and receive the full-planned syllabus of 150 jet hours in training. The percentage of the training output of pilots to be jet trained is continually increasing.

The Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training has made a study which indicates that even with the development of NAAS New Iberia, the capability to accomplish the full jet syllabus would not exist unless gunnery is staged at Port Isabel.

In order to fulfill the weapons training portion of the jet syllabus, a weapons staging field is required remote from congested and overpopulated areas. By providing a weapons staging facility more efficient use can be made of NAAS Chase Field and NAAS Kingsville, since dearming and arming aircraft at high-density airfields is a hazardous and time consuming operation. It will also relieve these fields of the operational requirements for tow aircraft and target sleeve pickup and drop. These operations interfere with other training operations causing loss of training time in other equally important phases of jet pilot training. In addition it would make it possible to comply with safety rules pertaining to flights of armed aircraft over inhabitated territory as flights of ordnance carrying aircraft over heavily populated areas will be precluded. The Port Isabel site will fulfill this requirement.

This field will also be used for jet familiarization practice. The projects included in the fiscal year 1956 appropriation request constitute the first increment in the development of this field in accordance with the master shore station development plan. If these projects were disapproved the important gunnery phase of the jet syllabus would be reduced to a minimum. The effect of this reduction would be felt in the fleets by adding another training burden on the already over-committed combat units as well as materially reducing fleet readiness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is a new station; is it?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. It is a former Army Air Force Field at Port Isabel, Tex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean it is a new station so far as being brought into the Navy is concerned?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it is an established station?

Admiral RUSSELL. It has a gunnery field in the southern portion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The large item reflected in the request at Port Isabel is the runway, taxiway, and parking apron wherein you are requesting $3,391,000. Why is this field necessary as an adjunct to the Navy at the present time?

Admiral RUSSELL. On the chart, the red areas, are committed to the Air Force in this area; the dark green area is over the land that is committed to Navy use in training, and the dark blue area is our gunnery area over the Gulf of Mexico. We need to take the gunnery training out of the central traffic which centers around Corpus Christi and Chase Field and Kingsville and bring that south and have direct access to the gunnery area, where the planes will fly down, refuel and rearm, pick up the tow target and go out over the Gulf of Mexico and shoot. The towed target will be brought back to an outlying field, rather than one of the main fields and the planes can refuel there and go immediately out and thus save a great deal of time in going on with the training, and do it more expeditiously.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of the contemplated area you have delineated on the chart as being under the jurisdiction of the Air Force is being transferred to the Navy?

Admiral RUSSELL. Only the property at Port Isabel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, you are going to involve yourself in shore activities farther up the beach, are you not?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How far up are you going?

Admiral RUSSELL. The dark green shows the area in which the Navy will be flying in training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is going to happen to the darker colored properties? Is the Air Force operating in there, or you?

Admiral RUSSELL. The Navy is, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then, in reality, you are taking in more property than just that at Isabel itself?

Admiral RUSSELL. This is already assigned by agreement with the Air Force, the air space over land shown in the dark green, and the air space over water which is our gunnery area, shown in dark blue.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I conclude that the rest of the properties shown on the chart will be still in the custody of the Air Force and operated by them?

Admiral RUSSELL. Their air space will be over the remainder of the shore, that in red.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of the total, as I envision the situation, in order to obviate contact you are operating airwise over the water and they are operating airwise over the land?

Admiral RUSSELL. In general, yes, sir. We are operating over the water and seacoast.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And it is assumed there will be no crackups in the operations in the course of your training?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is why we have made an agreed assignment over the land, sir.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Operations and administration building, $169,000.—This provides for the construction of a small permanent type building for administration and operations offices, pilots briefing rooms, aerology, and communications. There is no existing building on the station which is suitable for such use. This item is important to the gunnery phase of the jet syllabus.

Item 2. Control tower, $155,000.—There is no existing control tower at this former Army Air Force station. Present planning calls for approximately 300 daily landings and takeoffs from this field including both weapons training flights and jet familiarization practice flights. With this density of air traffic, a control tower is a necessity. Without this proposed tower, dangerous traffic conditions would exist within the control area of the field.

Item 3. Barracks and subsistence building, $380,000.—This provides adequate housing and messing facilities to support a 200-man operating and maintenance force and is necessary for support of the gunnery phase of the jet syllabus.

Item 4. Fuel storage, $348,000.—This consists of installing two Government-furnished, new steel underground aviation fuel storage tanks each having a capacity of 13,500 barrels. New truck loading facilities are to be provided, having 2 loading stands and 2 unloading stands complete with water filter, water separators, meters, and accessories. An access road and concrete parking stand are to be provided.

Item 5. Ordnance facilities, $195,000.—There are no ordnance facilities at Port Isabel or any structures which might be used for that purpose. Since this activity will stage all gunnery flights for the jet training program at both NAAS Kingsville and NAAS Chase, approximately 957 students will receive their gunnery instruction at Port Isabel each year. Each student will use 40 rockets and 2,800 pounds of 20-millimeter ammunition plus miscellaneous miniature bombs and pyrotechnics. Two triple arch magazines are required for storage of rockets. Additional storage is needed for miniature bombs and miscellaneous pyrotechnics.

Item 6. Outdoor recreational facilities, $27,000.—NALF Port Isabel is located in an isolated area relatively close to the border of Mexico. There are no recreational facilities available on the station, and only meager facilities are available in the city of Port Isabel. This provides for the construction of 2 tennis courts 60 by 100 feet each; 1 handball court 26 by 34 feet; 1 basketball court 50 by 94 feet, and 1 softball diamond. This item will improve the morale of personnel assigned to Port Isabel and discourage undesirable off-station forms of recreation.

Item 7. Rehabilitation of roads, $60,000.—The existing roads at Port Isabel have not been maintained since the end of World War II. These roads have chuck holes, extensive weed growths, and are at the point of being almost impassable. The roads will be scarified and additional base material added and compacted, and topped with 1-inch asphaltic concrete. Drainage ditches are to be cleaned to afford adequate drainage. This is essential in the program for the rehabilitation of Port Isabel.

Item 8. Perimeter fence, $25,000.—An adequate perimeter fence is needed to prevent livestock from entering and wandering about on the airfield. This is required for the prevention of damage to aircraft and property. The fence will be constructed of creosoted or cedar posts, and five stands of galvanized No. 12 gage barbed wire secured to the posts. Five wood-frame gates will be provided.

Item 9. Navy exchange, $89,000.—A building to house a small Navy exchange store for 200 men is required, to furnish minimum conveniences for personnel.

Item 10. Rehabilitate hangar, $152,000.—The existing semipermanent hangar has deteriorated since World War II and it is necessary to rehabilitate and repair the structure to prevent further damage. The hangar will be used for those aircraft requiring maintenance and/or repair during the normal conduct of operations.

Captain McKINNEY. In order to make the existing runway suitable for jet training, it is necessary to widen and extend it. This consists of constructing a 200-foot-wide by 2,600-foot-long extension providing an 8,000-foot-long runway for jet operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that paving, or compaction?

Mr. HANABURY. The extension will be new paving.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, $450,000 reflected for utilities. What are the utilities you are going to acquire?

Captain McKINNEY. Electrical, gas distribution system, water supply and distribution, and sewerage system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about land acquisition?

Captain McKINNEY. We are acquiring a total of 1,427.9 acres of land. That includes some transfer. The majority of this is from the city of Port Isabel, itself. This amount consists of 1,152.1 acres for

a nominal settlement of $1,000; the transfer of United States Government lands, 242.3 acres, for a nominal settlement of $1,000, and 2 private acreages, 1 in Cameron County, and private lands totaling about 20 acres, for a total of about $6,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you also acquire drainage easements on private lands for 2 or 3 thousand dollars.

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What advance engineering, if any, has been done on the overall work at Port Isabel?

Captain MCHENRY. There has been no advance planning as such. There has been a feasibility study. These estimates were prepared by Government engineers from records available to us.

(The following was submitted later:)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Port Isabel, Tex.

Operations and administration building Control tower Barracks and subsistence building Fuel storage Ordnance facilities Outdoor recreational facilities Rehabilitate roads Perimeter fence Navy exchange Rehabilitate hangar	(1)
Runways and taxiways: Detail plans, Lockwood and Andrews, Houston, Tex	$47,000
Utilities: Detail plans, Lockwood and Andrews, Houston, Tex	$23,600
Land acquisition	DPWO–8ND

[1] Feasibility Study and Report, Permanent Evaluation, Reconnaissance survey, aviation functional plan, advance planning reports and preliminary estimates of cost for all projects by Lockwood & Andrews, Houston, Tex., $39,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So that there has not been any advanced planning in this the same as those you have referred to heretofore?

Commander MALEY. The details of the requirements were not developed to a point to be able to complete the advance planning prior to the hearing. In a new field of this sort, there has to be considerable basic study before we get into the detailed planning, and the feasibility study was just for that purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course it is reasonable to assume the feasibility study does not indicate the costs as costs are reflected in an appropriation bill. That is a logical conclusion, is it not?

Commander MALEY. Not necessarily, sir. It indicates cost, but not with the degree of the detailed study we usually get in advance planning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then feasibility, as you interpret it, goes beyond the actual definition, meaning by that the usable potentials.

Commander MALEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But won't determine the total factors necessary for its cost factors. There has been no advance engineering to determine the exact dollar request, and the dollar requests have been formulated only in a hypothetical manner. That is true so far as this project pertains, is it not?

Commander MALEY. It is a little better than that, because we are able to compare the costs submitted with the feasibility study with the costs of comparable facilities in the rest of this program. And this has been done not only for these items; but, as a general rule,

throughout our entire program. Moreover, by review with the Departments of Defense, Air Force, and the Army, we have determined that the basic costs are comparable for all three services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Aside from those surveys you have referred to, am I to understand you are going ahead if the project is made available to you by the appropriations required, and have the advance planning?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, we will very definitely have advance planning and that will be followed by detailed and definitive plans and specifications. I might add for the record that as to most of these projects before the committee, we also examined them for economic feasibility. That is when the dollar sign comes in, although not with the same emphasis as it does on an advance planning study.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Considering the criteria of the two procedures, in the experience of this committee, we have found projects of this character are as much as 40 percent off in expenditures versus that of the cumulative figures acquired under feasibility. We have had that happen.

Captain MCHENRY. Have we had that in the Navy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, we had one of those instances 3½ years ago, and they had quite a slippage in there. I do not say the slippage will happen here; but put it this way, from the mathematics expressed here to the extent of $5,544,000, it is obviously subject to revision after your advance planning is completed. Is that correct?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, SOUTHERN LOUISIANA (NEW IBERIA)

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item in the justifications reflected as being the naval auxiliary air station, southern Louisiana (New Iberia). There are 25 items totaling $24,361,000.

Gentlemen, this is a new installation in its concept and it is purportedly highly controversial. Why do you specifically and particularly want this station at New Iberia? We have had expressions in the full committee from the Secretary and others, but I think at this point in the record we should have an explanation of the reasons why you need the station at New Iberia.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $24,571,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $24,571,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $10,475,000.

Admiral RUSSELL. If I may speak to that point, Mr. Chairman, in jet training we have a very considerable deficiency in facilities. We need two more bases to meet our program in jet training. Each of these bases should operate about 140 jet aircraft. After a great deal of search and in view of very selective criteria, the location at New Iberia has been chosen by the Navy as appropriate for 1 of these 2 required bases. We have not yet asked authorization for the second base to accommodate 140 jet aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

Admiral RUSSELL. I would like to enumerate the criteria we used in the selection of the location at New Iberia.

First, with reference to civil airways it should be south of the transcontinental civil airways.

Mr. SHEPPARD. First state why you have to go to that particular geographical location of the United States.

Admiral RUSSELL. The factor of weather points towards this particular area, and the availability of airspace for training points to this area. We should like to be on the seacoast. This is naval aviation and practically every area on the seacoast in the United States is taken up with some other activity airwise.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the necessity for the proximity to the ocean or water?

Admiral RUSSELL. Overwater training is very desirable in the case of naval aviation. That is one reason for Pensacola as a naval air training station, that plus the weather. The headquarters for primary naval air training is at Pensacola and the headquarters for the naval advanced flight training activities is at Corpus Christi.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is to be advanced training at New Iberia?

Admiral RUSSELL. This is to be advanced training in jet aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where in your primary training are you most concentrated geographically in the continental United States?

Admiral RUSSELL. Largely at Pensacola.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does Pensacola compare with elsewhere in the United States?

Admiral RUSSELL. We have elimination bases for the Reserves throughout the United States but the primary training is concentrated around Pensacola.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Consequently, if you are going into the secondary aspect, which I understand New Iberia would be?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would want it as close as possible to the primary training and you would save a considerable amount of money transporting students from the primary to the secondary training operation?

Admiral RUSSELL. It would be simplified if we could get them closer together. The advanced flight training activities are concentrated at the Corpus Christi, Chase Field, and Kingsville complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the dollar point of view, would not the proximity of New Iberia to Pensacola have a definite reflection on the dollar requirement as compared to a greater distance?

Admiral RUSSELL. It would be cheaper to operate in this fashion. I do not have the dollar figures, but if we have to ship planes a great distance it costs more, and shortness of travel for the students is a definite factor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has been brought to my attention by Members of the House that there are hazardous climatic conditions in this area compared to others.

Admiral RUSSELL. This area is subject to hurricanes. However, the Navy has for years had a very careful plan for evacuation in case of a storm and we track these storms. Otherwise the weather is about the best in the country for day-to-day training. I think the day factor is 83 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long have you had predetermined weather conditions to enable you to get ships out of the way of disturbing climatic elements so that you will not have ships lost and so on?

Admiral RUSSELL. We have had it in some form for many years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I mean intensified to the present degree?

Admiral RUSSELL. I would say since World War II it has developed into a precise science.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many ships have you lost under the present ability to predict weather conditions in the last 2 years, for example?

Admiral RUSSELL. I believe it is practically zero. The last major catastrophe was in 1926 when a hurricane took Pensacola by surprise and destroyed a great many training planes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, with modern science it is possible to have your weather conditions forecast in advance to the extent you do not anticipate any exaggerated destruction because of devastating weather?

Admiral RUSSELL, That is correct, sir. Each station has a very carefully thought out hurricane bill. It requires three degrees of readiness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the exposure of ships at New Iberia? I am speaking of number.

Admiral RUSSELL. With a properly operated bill our losses should be practically nothing. There might be some damage from high wind and rains to the installations, but not to aircraft themselves because they would be flown out to a shelter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the minimum time you would have to notice of weather conditions that would justify you local commander getting the ships out of the area?

Admiral RUSSELL. We would have 48 hours' notice, I believe.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And would you have enough available pilots to get the ships out in that length of time?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, with instructors and students both, there is always an opportunity to ferry the planes away.

I have mentioned one of the criteria, location south of the transcontinental civil airways.

The location is low, so the criterion of elevation of the ground was considered. We would like to have 15 feet above mean sea level. We want to be able to put in runways without sinking below marshland.

The distance from other military airfields from the aspect of clearance and being a unit in the Air Command.

Distance from commercial airfields is a factor.

We wanted to be within proximity to the Gulf of Mexico. We preferred to be within 35 miles.

We had to be clear of areas where other operations were already in effect.

We considered public transportation, the availability of railroads, water transportation, and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you feel that all the public utilities are there and available?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not anticipate being self-sustaining as far as electricity, telephone, and water?

Admiral RUSSELL. May I ask the civil engineer to answer that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Commander MALEY. Electric power is available in the vicinity. We would have to develop a water supply for the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You expect to develop water or a water supply on the station and not be dependent on adjacent municipalities?

Commander MALEY. We now anticipate that. At another field in that general area we were able to obtain water from private sources and we have arranged to do that, but at the moment we are counting on our own water supply.

Admiral RUSSELL. I might say, Mr. Chairman, some 30 sites were surveyed and some 12 were very thoroughly gone into. Although the New Iberia site was originally offered by the local people, a very sincere objection arose from the local farmers when they were apprised of the amount of land that would be taken, and because of the objection of the local people a very thorough reappraisal was made and Admiral Doyle of the Training Command said he never tried so hard to disprove the selection of a site and he had to admit this was where the field could be installed to the best advantage of the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your requirement under the land acquisition is 4,500 acres?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that your total requirement or do you anticipate having to come back later on and get additional land? I would like to pursue this very carefully, gentlemen.

Admiral RUSSELL. We do not see a need for more than the 4,500 acres for the field per se, but in order to protect this field from encroachment we will have to have further easements for radio towers or such that might be placed in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Show me on the map where the field will be.

Major FENTON. We will be located in this general area on the chart, which is to the west of New Orleans (indicating).

Admiral RUSSELL. Here is the old field (indicating).

Mr. SHEPPARD. How close are your runways to populated areas?

Admiral RUSSELL. Here is a detailed chart of the property owners. You will remember on the other chart there was a lake. Here is the lake and these are the proposed runways with the traffic pattern to the left and right. This land is reasonably high, I believe it runs from 8 to 25 feet, and all other sites in this area which we tried very vigorously to make do, are subject to flooding and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Taking a flight pattern as it is indicated, do both of these circles indicate both takeoff and landing both left and right?

Admiral RUSSELL. We would like to use them in both directions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would appear from this map that in this pattern to the left you will be flying over considerable population. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. HANABURY. Not a considerable population, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From what geographical area are your objections emanating with respect to the pattern in the map I have before me?

Admiral RUSSELL. The objection is led by the landowners in that area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But which pattern, the right or left or both of them?

Admiral RUSSELL. Both of them. These people have very sincere objections to our coming in there. They have comfortable farming lands farmed by tenant farmers largely, and they object to the displacement of those people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you outline what are going to be the confines of the station as such?

Admiral RUSSELL. I believe it is the solid white area and the shaded area would be affected by avigation easements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total amount of properties that you would displace, because people are one thing and properties another. By displacing one property you might displace six people. What is the total amount of properties you would displace?

Admiral RUSSELL. We are taking in the old municipal airport plus 3,500 acres and the actual displacement of property owners is 70 individual landowners and approximately 140 families.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status at the moment of this project insofar as the acquisition of the necessary land pertains to the confines of the white area reflected on this map? Are you going to have to go in and condemn all the land involved in the area because of the controversy between the military and the people residing on the land?

Admiral RUSSELL. I would say we do not yet have authority. It is in both the Senate and House versions of our authorization bill, but until we have the authority we cannot act. Thereafter, it appears we will have to condemn the majority of the properties.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the normal amount of time in that area for the successful termination of condemnation proceedings? Have you had that experience?

Mr. TIENCKEN. I have not. We deposit an amount predicated on the Navy's appraisal and then the property owners, with the judge's permission, can draw that amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is after the court determines the value?

Mr. TIENCKEN. No, the deposit which the Navy will make is predicated on its appraisal and the court may, in its discretion, hold out a certain part of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your legal experience in that geographical area as to condemnation proceedings? If, hypothetically, you had 100 pieces of property, the assumption is you would first negotiate, and if you negotiated 40, that would leave 60. Then, because of a difference of opinion by and between the Navy and those 60 people, you would have to go into condemnation proceedings. What normally would be the length of time that would elapse before the court would render its decision on the condemnation proceedings filed by the Navy?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We have had no experience in that particular area. The case of Alvin Callender in the New Orleans area is now being adjudicated by the court.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your general experience timewise in condemnation proceedings?

Mr. TIENCKEN. A fairly high percentage are adjudicated promptly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you mean by promptly? Do you mean 6 months, 10 months, or how long?

Mr. TIENCKEN. From 6 months to a year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you could be held up by condemnation proceedings in the final determination up to, let us say, 1 year and not be out of bounds for reasonable procedure?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That would be the time for adjudication of a price. We would get possession upon the filing of the declaration of taking.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is evident as far as the Navy is concerned at this time that you will take this land unless you are stopped by law.

Admiral RUSSELL. We feel we must do this; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total estimated cost for completion of this base?

Captain MCKINNEY. Approximately $35 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the length of time that you would anticipate, if the Congress gave you the $24,361,000 in this request, it would take to consummate the construction to the degree that it would become operational?

Captain MCHENRY. That is rather a long question. I would like to answer that by items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not care how you answer it. Your presentation at the moment is that you vitally need this base in order that you can carry out in continuity the policy of expansion presently under consideration not only as reflected under this bill but by reason of policy set down by various and sundry authorities. I am trying to get as reasonable an answer as I can to this question: If Congress gave you the full amount that is requested, how soon would this base be operational in the pattern presently designed?

Admiral RUSSELL. I would estimate we would operate 18 months to 2 years after we received authority and funds to proceed.

Captain MCHENRY. I would like to confirm the 2-year figure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This particular site now having been determined as essential to the requirements of the Navy in order that it may perfect the training requirements of its personnel would have no value to you unless you had it in toto?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is correct, Mr. Chairman, that is, what we are asking at this time, $24,361,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My next question is directed to the Bureau of Yards and Docks. What engineering has been done to justify the figure of $24,361,000?

Captain MCHENRY. We have had rather exhaustive engineering studies, although we do not have advance planning as we generally call it. We have the feasibility report prepared by F. Shutts Sons of Lake Charles, La., dated in January 1955, and coupled with that we have an economic study of two sites, one site, Houma, La., and the other site New Iberia, La., dated February 25, 1955.

These are rather exhaustive preparations and some of the exhibits you saw earlier are parts of these.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would these be a working format for continuation of evaluation?

Captain MCHENRY. They would.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are rather extensive as far as volume appearance.

How long would it take you to get your contracts out in order to have it engineered for contractual prices?

Captain MCHENRY. From 150 to 300 days we could have all these plans and specifications completed and advertised for award.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would that require special expedition on the part of your Department?

Captain MCHENRY. No, sir, that would be routine operating procedure. That is based on the time we receive the money and the authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is obvious, but I think it is reasonable to assume that this bill will clear the House and the Senate rather rapidly because of the time of the year that prevails, aside from the requirements that are involved militarily speaking.

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now I address my next question to the Comptroller of the Navy. When, in your opinion, if the Congress saw fit to appropriate the $24,361,000, would the money be apportioned to the Navy for the purpose of expediting this project? Where would it stand in priority?

Admiral SMITH. The priority of the project will be established by the Office of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations but the order of handling through my office may not have relationship to the priority list of public works projects. When the apportionment request comes from the Bureau of Yards and Docks it will be approved by my office and submitted expeditiously to the Secretary of Defense and to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much trouble would it be for you to find out from the Office of the Secretary of Defense—I do not expect you to ask the Bureau of the Budget, of course—how they consider this project in apportioning funds for it as compared to other projects?

Admiral SMITH. I understand it has a very high priority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You understand that but you have not been told that?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you be in a position by next Tuesday to advise us the position this project holds in priority apportionment-wise?

Admiral SMITH. I shall endeavor to get that information.

Admiral CLARK. As far as the Navy is concerned, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary of the Navy—I believe I can speak for him too—have said this would be one of our highest priority items, and I believe the Secretary of Defense will give us a favorable hearing on our priority list as he has in the past.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have the Chair's permission, if you desire to use it, to express to those who have cognizance of the apportionment of funds in the office of the Secretary of Defense that we are very carefully and cautiously inquiring into this, because of the controversy that has arisen, and my personal attitude will be largely controlled by whether you will get this money promptly or not.

Admiral CLARK. I can assure you this will be on our primary funding list.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That does not mean it will be funded that way.

Admiral CLARK. I defended this and assisted the Assistant Secretary of the Navy in defending this program before the Secretary of Defense and I am sure he is convinced this is a very urgent project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we may have some definite information on this we shall appreciate it very much.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) have given assurance that the construction of the Naval Auxiliary Air Station at New Iberia, La., has their approval and the apportionment request for funds will be given expeditious treatment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have before me a list that has been supplied to the committee, gentlemen, that indicates that some of the 25 components that make up the $24,361,000 do not fall within the No. 1 priority requirements. I hand it to you and ask you to check it and see if that verifies your previous statement.

Admiral CLARK. Yes; it does. I understand some of the components timewise may not be in a position where we could obligate the funds this year. We heard Captain McHenry say it would be about 300 days before the contracts could be let. Some of these components need to be started sooner than others, so what we would do would be to purchase the land, the other basic things as shown on our primary funding list. It may be that some of these things will not have to be actually started until after a year has passed and therefore we could not say we would put every one of these under contract within that time. As you can see, we have a larger requirement than we have funds and we try to phase it so that we get a usable facility for the high priority items and the rest of the funds will have to come in a little later. We might delay the clubs and we might have to temporarily store the ammunition elsewhere until we get going.

Captain MCKINNEY. The new auxiliary air station at New Iberia, La., is required to support the increased pilot output of 3,100 pilots per year, in the Naval Air Advanced Training Command. Admiral Russell has given you a detailed justification for this new station so I will merely enumerate the items, with the estimated costs of each item. These are the facilities that are required to provide an operable and usable auxiliary air station.

Item	
1. Aircraft parking area	$1,363,000
2. Runways (3) and taxiways	6,789,000
3. Operations building and control tower	509,000
4. Navigational aids and communication facilities	1,176,000
5. Utilities	1,368,000
6. Recreation building	720,000
7. Infirmary (20-bed)	569,000
8. Cold-storage building	130,000
9. Enlisted men's subsistence building (1,000 men)	435,000
10. Bachelor officer's quarters and mess (100 officers)	728,000
11. Cadet quarters and mess (124 cadets)	571,000
12. Enlisted men's barracks (1,032 men)	1,884,000
13. Public works transportation buildings and offices	189,000
14. Ordnance facilities	187,000
15. Fueling stations (4)	499,000
16. Aircraft maintenance hanger (1st increment)	1,439,000
17. Aviation fuel storage	406,000
18. Public works shop and office	387,000
19. Roads, walks, and parking area	213,000
20. Administration building (2-story)	229,000
21. Ground school and link trainer building	583,000
22. Land acquisition (4,500 acres in fee)	2,915,000
23. Supply facilities	817,000
24. Access road	161,000
25. Crash truck building and parking area	94,000
Grand total	24,361,000

Feasibility study, report, reconnaissance survey, soils and foundation study, preliminary estimates for all projects and economic site comparison studies, by F. Schutt's Sons, Lake Charles, La., $18,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see some items that are disturbing. For example, I would consider navigation aids to be of paramount importance.

Admiral RUSSELL. That is true, but the runways have to be built first.

Captain MCKINNEY. In that connection, you will note the entire amount is not here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true. We want to feel here that if this project is of the importance you have testified it is—and I am satisfied you are testifying correctly—that nothing happens to this project later by those who are handing out the funds that will tie this project up. You have a controversial project here in the first place because of its location, and I think we should be assured that everybody from the Secretary of Defense down, and I might ask the Bureau of the Budget for an answer, because we feel in an operation of this kind if it is worthy of this kind of expenditure and it is important to your training requirements, this the type of project that should be consummated as rapidly as possible.

Captain MCKINNEY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To me this type of project is outstanding compared to some of the others.

Captain MCKINNEY. For example, you will note under item 5 we are asking for $1,368,000 for utilities. In the supplemental funding we are only asking for $368,000. That applies to a lot of items here.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item which is the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., wherein you are making a request for $385,000. Will you present your justifications on the $385,000?

I note at this installation the plant value is $14,991,384; funded construction not in plant value, $889,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $723,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $723,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $4,192,500.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is to supply family housing for key personnel. We are asking for 4 senior officer quarters and 20 junior officer quarters or a total of 24 family housing units for this station, which is located about 7 miles north of Milton, Fla.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of housing is the officer group living in now?

Captain MCFARLAND. We have 1 permanent quarters for officers and 14 temporary-type houses which are not suitable for permanent housing. In addition we have 42 units of rental housing occupied by officers and 71 title VIII houses. We have a total of 114 units which are considered adequate and our gross requirement is 337 units and our net requirement is 323 units. This is a small increment in meeting the total officer requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you coming back for future housing in that area?

Captain MCFARLAND. In future programs; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this housing been engineered?

Captain MCHENRY. No, sir; there has been no advance planning engineering on this project. The estimates were established by criteria from the Department of Defense.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, which is the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif., wherein you are requesting a total of $3,729,000 covering 3 items.

I note at this installation the plant value is $73,999,135; funded construction not in plant value, $10,818,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,729,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,729,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $45,353,000.

Will you proceed with your justifications for those items?

Captain McKinney. The first item is aircraft cleaning and stripping, $547,000.

It is necessary to preclean and paint strip aircraft prior to examination and evaluation for preplanning and control of depth of overhaul, a hazardous operation involving extremely caustic solvents. Outdoor operations cause delays due to inclement weather. Rain dilutes and washes off solvents before they become effective; the sun drys them before they become effective; personnel danger is increased by unexpected wind overspray.

The next item is seadrome lighting, $182,000. This item is to provide permanent lights for all-weather night operations of seaplanes in the naval air station, Alameda, seadrome. Without this, the continued use of the present temporary installation will adversely affect seaplane operations in this area with the ever-present danger of an airplane accident or loss of life in stormy weather to boat crews who must individually turn on each present buoy mounted light.

The next item is dredging and fill, $3 million. This item is urgently required to dredge the entrance channel and turning basin to permit docking of *Midway* and *Forrestal* class carriers at the Naval Air Station, Alameda. Dredged fill will be used to make additional useful land. Without this item, these types of carriers will be unable to dock at any air station on the west coast.

We are taking advantage of the land fill from the dredging operation at Alameda, which is almost all built-up land.

Mr. Sheppard. Has this project been engineered?

Captain McHenry. Yes, item No. 1 was engineered by Myron C. Gould of San Francisco, Calif., for $1,535, item No. 2 was engineered by the Tudor Engineering Co. of San Francisco, Calif., for $7,000 and item No. 3 was engineered by the Navy Department public works officer, all within the past 6 months.

Naval Air Station, Atlantic City, N. J.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, which is the naval air station at Atlantic City, N. J., wherein you are requesting a total of $233,000 for 2 items.

I note at this installation the plant value is $9,857,422; funded construction not in plant value, $2,353,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $233,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $233,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $46,888,000.

Will you proceed with your justification for those items?

Captain McKinney. The first item is a supply warehouse, $188,000. Additional covered storage space is required to prevent deterioration

of material now being stored in the open and to provide urgently needed spare parts storage for aircraft. Our existing covered storage space is 56,000 square feet and our requirement is about 112,000 square feet, leaving a deficit of about 56,000 square feet. This request will still leave us with a deficit of about 36,000 square feet.

The next item is an access road to the magazine area, $45,000. An access road to the magazine area is required because the lengthening of runway 13/31 cuts off existing roads to the area in question. Construction is required for a system of roads to connect the various loading, unloading, and storage areas to provide access to these areas within the Bureau of Ordnance safety clearance criteria and free of built-up building areas over roads strong enough to carry ordnance trucks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes; item 1 was engineered by the firm of architects of Edwards & Green, of Philadelphia, Pa., for $2,000; and item 2 was engineered by the Navy Department public works officer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When?

Captain MCHENRY. Within the last 6 months.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, BROWN FIELD, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now pick up the next item, which is the naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, San Diego County, Calif., wherein you are requesting $214,600 for family housing.

I note at this installation the plant value is $3,546,000; funded construction not in plant value, $4,022,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $622,600; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $622,600; and the estimated future appropriation required, $15,954,000.

Will you present your justification for that item?

Captain MCKINNEY. This item is to provide for 2 senior officer quarters and 3 junior officer quarters and 10 enlisted men's quarters which are urgently required to alleviate the critical deficiency of family housing for key personnel at this station. The drastic change in the mission of Brown Field from a small World War II training field to a naval auxiliary air station capable of supporting jet aircraft has brought about an increase in the number of personnel on board with no provision being made, to date, to provide family housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do hou have accommodations there now to take care of them adequately?

Captain MCFARLAND. We do not.

We have no permanent quarters for officers and 32 of our officers and enlisted men are in rented housing, all of which is substandard except 5 enlisted men's units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is Brown Field?

Captain MCFARLAND. Nine miles southeast of San Diego, Calif.

NAVAL AIR STATION, BRUNSWICK, MAINE

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, which is the naval air station at Brunswick, Maine, for which you are requesting a total of $3,285,000 composed of 13 subsidiary requirements.

I note at this installation the plant value is $11,896,005; funded construction not in plant value, $14,254,500; existing unfunded authorization, $1,712,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,533,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,618,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $28,269,000.

I notice an item of $918,000 that has to do with the central heating plant. Brunswick, Maine, is an old operation, is it not?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes. It was established in 1943 but was inactivated in 1946 and reactivated in 1951.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to have to completely overhaul that heating plant?

Captain McKINNEY. Public Law 207 of the 83d Congress provided $1 million for a boilerhouse which is not sufficient to handle the expanding needs. This is for additional heating equipment.

(The following was submitted later:)

With this item the steam plant now under construction which has been designed to furnish all the heating requirements for the station, will be completed. Without this item the activity at the station during cold weather will be curtailed due to a lack of steam and heat.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is a continuity of increments, and this is the second increment; is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir. It is to heat the expanded facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many of the rest of the requirements fall into the second increment category?

Captain McKINNEY. That is the only one, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All the rest are new facilities that are needed on the base?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir; plus item 13 for the crash facilities, which was authorized by Public Law 534, 83d Congress.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1.—Composite approach lighting, $82,000.—This provides for installation of high intensity approach lights off the end of the instrument runway. It will fill an existing gap in an instrument landing approach between the ground-controlled approach system and the point of touchdown on the runway. Without this item a necessary link in an instrument landing will be open and a potential for aircraft accidents with attendant loss of life will continue to exist during operations that must be conducted in bad weather and low visibility.

Captain McHENRY. There is one item of runway and taxiway strengthening, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under what category as expressed here would that fall, Captain?

Captain McHENRY. Item 3.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Airfield paving and soil stabilization?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are asking for $222,000 for that. What are you going to pave there?

Captain McHENRY. This item covers repaving and strengthening of the runway, stabilizing runway shoulders, and hardstands for crash equipment.

(The following was submitted later:)

The purpose of this item is to recondition the crosswind runway which is vital to the all-weather operations that need be conducted at this station. In addition, part of the taxiway available for the 8,000 feet dual runways must be strengthened to permit its use by heavy patrol planes. Without it the all-weather operations will be curtailed and intermittent use of the runways for taxiways must continue with resulting delays in landings and takeoffs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the theater situation?

Captain MCKINNEY. This station has no theater at present. Movies are presently shown occasionally in the gymnasium, restricting the athletic program and increasing the maintenance of the gymnasium floor. During the winter months personnel living aboard and in adjacent housing projects must seek recreation on the station due to the rigorous climate which adversely affects commuting to nearby small towns. Without this item (No. 4) the present problem of lowered morale will continue. $266,000 is requested for this item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the personnel strength at this station?

Captain MCKINNEY. The present officer strength is 215, enlisted men 1,912, civilians 361, and the plan at the end of 1957 is for 409 officers, 2,651 enlisted men, and 361 civilians.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing for fire protection in addition to what you have there now?

Captain MCKINNEY. We have an antiquated system there at present. The fires are reported by telephone. We have had several disastrous fires there with the loss of 3 lives and over $500,000 of property damage. This will provide a modern fire alarm system, sir. $53,000 is requested for this item which is item No. 5.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 6. Fire-protection systems, $143,000.—This provides for installation of fire-protection systems in various buildings used for quarters, medical care, and recreation. Buildings whose design is not compatible with this installation will be provided with automatic fire-detection devices. In addition, the capacity of the water reservoir will be increased. Without this item fire-fighting capabilities of the station will be below a safe standard and uncontrolled fires could result if wind conditions were such as to spread a conflagration.

Item 7. Supply facilities, $300,000.—This provides for construction of essential warehouse facilities. This additional space is required for the increased volume of spare parts associated with modern day aircraft. This item will increase the operational efficiency of assigned squadrons because delays in obtaining spare parts will be greatly reduced as most spare parts will be stored on the station.

Item 8. Ordnance facilities and land acquisition, $245,000.—This provides for the construction of 1 small-arms and pyrotechnic magazine, 5,400 feet of railroad track, including turnouts and a 4-car unloading siding. Approximately 150 acres of land will be required. Unless it is provided the mission of the station to support assigned aircraft patrol squadrons will be curtailed as motor transit shipment of high explosives is not approved under the icy road conditions that exist at this station in the winter.

Item 9. Water mains, $95,000.—This is to construct a pipeline to connect the station water system to off-station water sources and to make an interconnection to an existing and a proposed reservoir on the station. The present water system cannot handle the requirements of the station for normal usage and provide a fire-fighting reserve.

Item 10. Communications facilities, $151,000.—This provides for construction of a VHF/UHF transmitter facility. It is an increment of the development of communications facilities at this station to provided modern equipment to accommodate the latest types of aircraft.

Item 11. BOQ and mess, $686,000.—Present facilities consist of four temporary, wartime constructed, buildings, hazardous to personnel because of substandard design and construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is a compass rose?

Captain MCKINNEY. A compass rose is a nonmagnetic turntable that they mount the planes on for calibrating the compass equipment.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 12. Construct compass rose, $39,000.—This is for the construction of a standard compass rose, a standard requirement at every air station. None

exists at NAS, Brunswick. It consists of a concrete apron 120 feet in diameter accessible by means of a 200-foot-long taxiway 75 feet wide. In the center of the apron is a bronze (nonmagnetic) turntable. The taxiway and apron are designed to support 50,000-pound wheel loadings. Without this item present operations will be forced to continue under makeshift methods.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about your crash facilities?

Captain MCKINNEY. Those are the emergency fire and rescue facilities needed during aircraft operation.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 13. Crash facilities, $85,000.—There are no existing facilities for housing crash equipment at this station. Due to the severe weather experienced at this station, it is urgently required that equipment and crew have protective covering and work space for efficient and effective storage and repair of crash facilities and equipment. The present crash equipment allowance of 5 vehicles, necessitates 4 stalls to house and maintain these vehicles in a state of readiness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice reflected in your justifications the following comment "does not include 750 acres to be acquired in fiscal 1954." What is the story on that?

Mr. HANABURY. This is land acquisition for ordnance facilities and communication facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why has that been pending over this period of time? What has happened? This was to be acquired with 1954 funds.

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has happened?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We have had quite a little difficulty trying to ascertain all of the property ownerships to develop the title information and survey the area, and there was some protest on it which prevented immediately surveying it. We finally got that ironed out and the project is just about ready for acquisition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your holdup has been due, as I interpret your answer, to the fact of lost property records, missing records, or inability to trace records; is that it?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Partly that and partly the fact that particular individuals protested and suggested that the particular ammunition storage facility be located elsewhere, and a review of the requirements necessitated delay. A decision was finally reached and we are now proceeding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But you take the time element in what is involved here, which is a much less controversial area compared with New Iberia, and the fact you are going to get on your horse irrespective in the New Iberia thing, it looks like this is a rather long drawn out thing comparatively speaking. What happened that you wanted to avoid condemnation proceedings? Why this very favorable consideration compared with some others in a controversial status?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The real answer to that is that we misjudged the acreage that we wanted in our original presentation. At that time, there was general language which we considered was sufficient to buy any amount of land. It developed after the Comptroller General's opinion that we were limited to the exact acreage and we tried to fit the particular storage into the authorized acreage which was set out in the specifications.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any new facilities in this request that are dependent on acquiring that land—ordnance facilities?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir. The ordnance facility project is this program ties in with the figures for the acquisition of land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call your attention to a like situation that took place in the committee early this morning, in which I referred to a report of the committee on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1955, wherein it was stated that the estimates presented to the committee by the Department on this type of facilities in many instances were considerably higher than similar costs for the Air Force, and in the delineation of the geographical areas we find that the fire and crash stations at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, which we had under discussion at that time, was excluded because of the inconsistence in the cost reflected by and between the two services. Now what has been done since the comments of the committee in that report, because of the fact we find here, under 13 "Crash facilities; building, and collateral," a total of $85,000?

Captain MCHENRY. After a review of the designed standards following the elimination of that item, the Navy decided to effect design changes in the crash facility. As a result, the cost per square foot which was budgeted at $19.80 in the 1955 program, has now been reduced to $15 per square foot for the 1956 program. Funding in the amount of only $85,000 is requested in this program, although the existing authorization under Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress is $105,000 based on the budget figures used last year. We consider the facility now planned will be adequate for the intended purpose and give bigger performance at a lower maintenance cost for the facilities required for the operation of this permanent naval station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the difference between the original figures and those here predicated was based on——

Captain MCHENRY. Engineering redesign and of a more austere nature.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we took off some of the trimmings; is that correct?

Captain MCHENRY. Very correct.

Captain MCKINNEY. Under item 8, "Ordnance facilities," if I implied there were no other increments involved, I did not mean to mislead you?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think you did.

Captain MCKINNEY. This provides for the construction of one small-arms and pyrotechnic magazine, 5,400 feet of railroad track including turn-outs and a 4-car unloading siding and approximately 150 acres of land. So that the total is included in that amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this Brunswick project been engineered; if so, by whom and when?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir, it has. Item 4 has been engineered by A. J. Harriman, of Auburn, Maine, for $2,888; item 7 by W. Chester Brown & Associates, of Boston, Mass., for $1,200; item 11 by Colletti Bros., of Boston, Mass., for $6,120; item 13, by W. Chester Brown & Associates, of Boston, for $16,600. All other items by the district public works officer of the First Naval District.

NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD, FLA., DUVAL COUNTY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next project "Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.," composed of 13 items constituting a total request of $9,099,200.

I note at this installation the plant value is $18,720,593; funded construction not in plant value, $10,584,000; existing unfunded authorization, $521,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $8,080,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $9,779,200; and the estimated future appropriation required, $14,424,000.

How old is Cecil Field?

Captain McKINNEY. It was established December 15, 1941.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now the composition of requirements as expressed and as broken down in the respective cost factors hypothetically suggests that the airfield represents $1,926,000. How many of those are new projects as against those rehabilitated in the continuity of projects over the life span of this particular station?

Captain McKINNEY. Item 3 is the second increment of the hangar and item 5 is the second increment of the fueling station. All of the rest of them are new items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is this known as, funcitonally speaking? Is this a master jet station?

Admiral RUSSELL. This is a master jet field. With your permission, I should like to show to the committee the general agreement for these flight support stations. I will ask Mr. Hanabury to point out the various elements which make up the flight support stations.

Mr. HANABURY. The Jacksonville complex we are talking about—Jacksonville is an airport and industrial station—as you know is on the St. Johns River. We do not have carrier docks as shown here; those are over at Mayport. The complex consists of the airport and industrial station at Jacksonville; the master jet field, Cecil Field, and 2 auxiliary landing fields, 1 of which is Mayport, which will be used for carrier off loading, and another 1 in the program is Whitehouse Field which will be used primarily for field carrier land operations and complete support of the Jacksonville complex. Then about 75 miles south we have another field called Naval Auxiliary Air Field——

Mr. SHEPPARD. In relation to the north and south, indicating Jacksonville as the extreme northern point and Key West the extrene south, where would this be between the two points?

Mr. HANABURY. About 350 or 400 miles south. Key West is away down; Jacksonville is up here [indicating]. Cecil Field is about 12 or 14 miles west of Jacksonville; Mayport is about 17 miles east. Key West is not a master station; it is an antisubmarine and patrol station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have received a communication from Congressman Bennett of Florida in relation to Cecil Field, which we will place in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES E. BENNETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, RE ORDNANCE FACILITIES, PARACHUTE BUILDING, CECIL FIELD NAVAL AIR STATION

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear here today to testify in favor of an appropriation of $370,000 for ordnance facilities and $137,000 for a parachute building at Cecil Field Naval Air Station, Fla. These projects were authorized in the military public works bill last year, Public Law 534, 83d Congress. However, this committee had some questions about them when it considered the supplemental appropriation bill last August, and they were deferred for that reason. It is my understanding that this difficulty has now been resolved.

There is a real need for these projects at Cecil Field. Without the ordnance facilities, this station will be unable properly to fill its mission to support assigned fleet aircraft for safe stowage and handling of ammunition. There are no existing ordnance shop facilities at this station and there is no space available which can be used for this purpose. The proposed ordnance shops are required for the safe and proper arming, disarming, repair, and maintenance of all types of ordnance used in the fleet training conducted at this station. The various types of weapons that will be worked on, consist of bombs, fuses, detonators, rockets, rocket motors aerial mines, torpedoes and torpedo warheads, and certain other new classified ordnance developments.

There is also an urgent need for the parachute building. The Navy estimates that there will be a need for 400 parachutes at Cecil Field when presently planned expansion is completed. Safety regulations require that each parachute be repacked at prescribed intervals. This can be done satisfactorily only in buildings designed for this purpose, since there must be control over temperature, humidity, dirt, and dust. This function is being carried out now in a building which was not designed for this purpose and which is unsatisfactory. Without this building, present unsafe and satisfactory arrangements will continue to jeopardize the safety of aviation personnel.

Thank you for permitting me to testify here today in favor of these projects.

Admiral RUSSELL. I submit the following for the record:

The first item is for airfield pavements:

(*a*) Runway (8,000 x 200 feet)	$1,757,000
(*b*) Taxiways	169,000

This provides for the construction of one 8,000 x 200 feet runway with connecting taxiways. It is a part of the planned development of this field into a master jet air station.

The number of planes to be assigned requires that another runway be available to accommodate the traffic.

Item 2. Supply warehouse, $517,000—This provides for the second increment of permanent supply warehousing for aeronautical parts. It is required in order to store needed spare parts for the aircraft operating from the field.

Item 3. Hangar (second increment), $1,168,000.—This is for the completion of the last third of a hangar now in use at NAS Cecil Field. It consists of an open hangar area 150 by 261 feet and a two-story lean-to 32 by 261 feet and will provide the proper maintenance areas for the aircraft assigned to this station.

Item 4. Utilities, $862,000.—

(*a*) Electrical	$513,000
(*b*) Water, sanitary and steam	135,000
(*c*) Roads, walks and parking	111,000
(*d*) Telephones	21,000
(*e*) Drainage	82,000
Total	862,000

This provides for the increased utilities required along with the incremental development of this station. Every administrative, operational, and training facility of the field is functionally dependent upon adequate utilities.

Item 5. Fueling stations (4) (second increment), $577,000.—This provides for the construction of fueling stations capable of refueling 8 aircraft at a rate of 400 gallons per minute per aircraft. If the item is not provided, fleet-training operations will continue to be hindred. Fuel-consumption rates for modern jet-type aircraft reduce a requirement that conventional truck refuelers cannot satisfy in the time necessary for refueling.

Item 6. Recreation facilities, $428,000.—

(*a*) Site preparation	$113,000
(*b*) Facilities:	
1. 1 football field, 2 softball diamonds, 6 basketball courts, and 2 handball courts	36,000
2. Utilities	41,000
(*c*) Theater (500 seats)	238,000
Total	428,000

This provides for the construction of a 500-seat theater with stage for training, educational, and recreational programs. Additional facilities will consist of 2 softball diamonds (1 lighted), 1 football field, 2 handball courts, and 6 basketball courts. With this item the station will be able to prosecute a well-rounded physical-training program. This station is 13 miles from suitable recreation facilities.

Item 7. Boresighting range (4 1,000 foot firing positions), $150,000.—This is to construct a four-position live firing boresighting range. The ranges are required to check the dispersion pattern of aircraft guns which must be checked after every 2,000 rounds are fired to insure the proper degree of accuracy.

Item 8. Ordnance facilities, $557,000.—

(*a*) 6 HE magazines	$166,000
(1) Topsoil and grassing, (2) drainage, (3) paving.	
(*b*) 1 small arms magazine	15,000
(*c*) 4 fuse and detonator magazines	40,000
(1) Topsoil, grassing, paving, and drainage.	
(*d*) 15 ready rocket magazines	58,000
(*e*) 1 inert storage magazine	134,350
(1) Enclosed space, (2) covered space, (3) site preparation, (4) collateral.	
(*f*) 1 ordnance shop	143,650
Total	557,000

This is for the construction of a fourth increment of required magazines inert storehouse and ordnance shop. Without this the station will be unable to comply with Bureau of Ordnance and CNO criteria for storage of ammunition and the mission to support fleet aircraft will be seriously impaired.

Item 9. Security facilities, $53,000.—This provides for the construction of a permanent gatehouse and office space for the security department and the industrial relations department. The present facilities consist of a ramshackle building assembled from abandoned construction shacks.

Item 10. Bachelor officers quarters and subsistence, $1,162,000.

(*a*) Structure	$939,000
(*b*) Utilities	134,500
(*c*) Collateral:	
1. BOQ	86,250
2. Subsistence	2,250
	1,162,000

This provides for the construction of a BOQ facility including messing for 150 capacity and is urgently required at NAS Cecil Field to alleviate existing substandard officer berthing and to provide minimum basic support for officer personnel assigned to this activity. These facilities will replace existing BOQ facilities which are totally inadequate and insufficient to meet minimum requirements of established criteria. In addition, the type of construction of existing facilities precludes any attempt to adapt or modify these structures for permanent use.

NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD, FLA.

Airfield pavements: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $2,000, estimate.
Supply warehouse: Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Jacksonville, Fla., $2,650.
Hangar: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $1,485.
Utilities: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $700.
Fueling stations: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $4,300, estimate.
Recreation facilities: Theater—Norman M. Giller & Associates, Miami Beach, Fla., $3,300, estimate; outdoor facilities—Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Jacksonville, Fla., $800, estimate.
Boresight range: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $800.
Ordnance facilities: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $5,210.
Security facilities: PWO NAS Cecil Field, Fla.
Bachelor officers quarters.
Ordnance facilities: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $3,700, estimate.
Parachute building: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $1,345.
Family housing: 1 senior officer, 12 junior officers, 77 employees.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. Proceed with the next item "Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif."

I note at this installation the plant value is $4,821,284; funded construction not in plant value, $272,000; existing unfunded authorization, $89,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $787,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $876,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $7,093,000.

You are providing here for a crash fire station at a cost of $89,000.

Captain McKinney. This is an item for which we had prior authorization. It pertains to the same objection as those crash facilities you discussed heretofore.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the difference between the figures presented in this present budget and that of last year, if any?

Captain McKinney. There is no difference in the figures. As you recall, all those were held up.

Mr. Sheppard. Captain McHenry, what is your comment on this?

Captain McHenry. The crash fire station at Crows Landing was estimated at $14.19 a foot. I think the minimum it will provide is a satisfactory service for the intended purpose. A review of the design was made not only by the Navy but jointly with representatives of the Air Force and Department of Defense, and a favorable final agreement with DOD by the two services was reached on this matter. Certain other fire crash stations in Navy's 1955 program have been reduced in cost due to design change. The project design here, however, is the minimum structure and is not subject to further price reduction.

Captain McKinney. I might add that under the Navy procedure we actually house the emergency crews right there in the building, and the Air Force procedure is just to have them there on a temporary basis and then let them go. We have them there all of the time, so that there is a little greater requirement for our crash fire stations than there is for the Air Force. They are on duty 24 hours.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item, "Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.," composed of three items—ordnance loading ramp, land acquisition, and ammunition storage, creating a total request for $591,000.

The plant value is $17,776,609; funded construction not in plant value, $203,000; existing unfunded authorization, $225,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $992,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,217,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $24,992,000.

What is the function of the last one, ammunition storage?

Captain McKinney. El Centro is a naval auxiliary air station for Miramar Master Jet Complex. As such, it handles the major portion of the combat training for 4 air groups consisting of some 283 aircraft. This training actually consists of firings and bombings on the adjacent impact areas, using combat ammunition, bombs, and rockets.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Ordnance loading ramp, $282,000.—An ordnance loading ramp is required to replace the existing Marston matting rendered unusable by heavy jet aircraft and jet blasts. The existing ramp in addition to being hazardous from the standpoint of flying rocks and sand caused by jet blasts which can seriously damage both personnel and aircraft, is also within the 750-foot standard clearance line from the centerline of the adjoining runway.

Item 2. Land acquisition (ordnance area). (a) Land, 210 acres, $84,000.—This acquisition is required to meet minimum safety distance criteria for ordnance structures as set forth by the Bureau of Ordnance.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, EL CENTRO, CALIF.

Ordnance loading ramp: *Porter, Urquhart & Beavin, Los Angeles, $2,110 (estimated).*
Land acquisition: *DPWO–11ND.*
Ammunition storage: *DPWO–11ND.*

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, FALLON, NEV.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.," composed of a series of 4 items, including family housing which will make 5, in the total amount of $1,264,700.

At this installation the plant value is $10,689,156; funded construction not in plant value, $5,072,000; existing unfunded authorization, $101,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,467,700; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,559, 700; and the estimated future appropriation required, $20,326,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. That includes family housing for $131,700.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is not that a rather old project?

Captain MCKINNEY. It was established originally in 1944 and disestablished in 1946 and reactivated in 1951. This is actually the field-carrier support practice for bombing and cold-weather training. It is about 220 miles northeast of Alameda, which is the master jet field, the main seaport industrial station for this jet complex. At this station pilots are given 2 or 3 weeks' intensified gunnery training before and after serving with the fleet carriers.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Recreation building, $420,000.—This provides for the construction of an all-purpose recreation building to provide facilities for a combination gymnasium-theater-chapel, bowling alley, and billiard room, library and Navy exchange. The isolation of this station makes on-station recreation mandatory.

Item 2. Barracks, $558,000.—

(*a*)	2–172 man barracks	$464, 400
(*b*)	Collateral equipment	53, 300
(*c*)	Utilities	40, 300
	Total	558, 000

This is needed to house personnel attached to units assigned to this station for training. The present barracks do not have the capacity to house these personnel. If not provided the housing problem will have to be solved by converting some shop buildings.

Item 3. Live firing bore-sighting range, $63,000.—The range is required to check the dispersion pattern of aircraft guns which must be checked after every 2,000 rounds are fired to insure accuracy.

Item 4. Crash facilities, $92,000.—This provides for the construction of a standard crash truck facility with provisions for three truck stalls and housing for the operating personnel. Weather conditions at this station are extreme in both summer and winter.

Item 5. Family housing, $131,700.—

(*a*) Senior officer (field grade), 1,500 square feet average, 2 each at $20,250	$40,500
(*b*) Junior officer (company grade), 1,125 square feet average, 6 each at $15,200	91,200
Total, 8	131,700

The eight MOQ are urgently required to alleviate the critical deficiency of housing that exists at this station. This deficiency is due to the fact that this station is isolated with no adequate community support available. The nearest large community is Reno, Nev., approximately 60 miles distant.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, FALLON, NEV.

Recreation building: Sverdrup & Parcel, San Francisco, $5,800.
Barracks: Pwo.
Live firing bore-sight range: By DPWO 12ND.
Crash facilities: Sverdrup & Parcel, San Francisco, $212.00 [1]
Family housing: 2 senior officers; 6 junior officers.—None, based on DOD criteria.

NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.," composed of 6 requirements under the subheads, and the total amount of money requested for 1956 is $2,224,000.

The plant value is $56,635,875; funded construction not in plant value, $6,982,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,224,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,224,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $29,459,000.

What is the necessity that creates these additional facilities there? Jacksonville is an old operation; so why the necessity for this?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is to provide facilities for the fleet carrier operation, and is part of the complex we just explained on this chart, and Jacksonville is the seaport industrial station for this Cecil Field master jet complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the category of electronics required here in the amount of $186,000 in item No. 1?

Captain MCHENRY. That is under "Collateral equipment and electronics."

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Communication facilities, $419,000.—This is to provide radio equipment in a remote location free from electrical interference for positive control of aircraft operations. Communications with aircraft equipped with UHF only are especially unreliable without remote receiver and transmitter facilities.

Item 2. Fleet logistic air wing terminal, $102,000.—This provides for remodeling and equipping of an existing building to provide a fleet logistic air wing terminal along with facilities for customs, district passenger agent, and courier service. Existing facilities are overcrowded and inefficiently laid out. This item is required for health and comfort of passengers, many of whom are dependents going and arriving from overseas, and for control of passengers for customs and immigration.

Item 3. Photographic laboratory, $236,000.—This is for the construction of a photographic laboratory capable of meeting the requirements of the air station and the photographic squadrons based aboard. The small existing facility is so overcrowded that it is common practice for equipment required to carry on one operation to be broken down, stored, and other specified equipment set up in its place to carry out a different type of operation in day-to-day business.

[1] Estimated only, prorated part of larger contract.

Item 4. Connecting taxiway, $344,000.—This is to provide a taxiway between the seaplane area and the landplane area. The old seaplane area is presently used for overhaul and repair operations and by landplane fighter squadrons. The present access is circuitous and hazardous due to obstructions and is not lighted at night. Despite great care taken by taxi directors and pilots minor accidents are not infrequent and costly. A hazardous condition exists and planes of the VP squadrons are frequently bottled in by O. and R. aircraft being towed along the route.

Item 5. Warmup apron, $201,000.—This provides for the construction of a new 10-inch thick concrete apron, including mooring eyes, drainage structures, and strengthening of underground utilities to replace an existing deteriorated apron.

Item 6. Bombing targets including land acquisition, $922,000.—

1. Etonia bombing target, Putnam County, Fla.:	
(*a*) Site preparation, fencing, observation post access roads, communications, electric generator	$66,000
(*b*) Acquisition of land, 2,560 acres, at $32.40	83,000
Subtotal	149,000
2. Rosier bombing target, Bradford County, Fla.:	
(*a*) Site preparation, fencing, observation post access roads, communications, generator	72,000
(*b*) Acquisition of land, 2,560 acres, at $53.90	138,000
Subtotal	210,000
3. Sharon bombing target, Clay County, Fla.:	
(*a*) Site preparation, fencing, observation post access roads, communications, engine generator	79,800
(*b*) Acquisition of land, 2,560 acres, at $45	115,200
Subtotal	195,000
4. Stevens Lake bombing target, Clay County, Fla.:	
Site preparation, observation post, access roads, communications, generator	65,000
(*b*) Avigation easements, 17,250 acres, at $3.35	58,000
(*c*) Acquisition of land, to be obtained from State at no cost	
Subtotal	123,000
5. Union bombing target, Union County, Fla.:	
(*a*) Site preparation, fencing, observation posts, access roads, communications, generator	104,000
(*b*) Acquisition of land, 2,560 acres, at $55	141,000
Subtotal	245,000
Total	922,000

Detailed budget justification for this project is included in the classified portion of this program.

NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Communciation facilities: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $800 (estimate).
Fleet logistics air wing terminal, and photographic laboratory: Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Jacksonville, Fla., $2,670.
Connecting taxiway: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $600 (estimate.)
Warmup apron: DPWO 6ND.
Bombing targets, including land acquisition: PWO NAS Jax.

NAVAL AIR STATION, KEY WEST, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is that of the naval air station, Key West, Fla., made up of three components—"Aviation fuel storage," "Boathouse," and "Family housing" for a total of $484,900.

At this installation the plant value is $16,952,531; funded construction not in plant value, $5,509,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $504,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $777,900; and the estimated future appropriation required, $18,285,000.

What kind of boathouse are you going to build down there?

Captain McKINNEY. That is a boathouse to house air-sea rescue operations in that area, and crash boat facilities to house equipment which is valued at about $50,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would assume the aviation fuel storage is above ground down there; is it not?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir, two 5,000-barrel tanks. This will tie into existing lines.

Mr. HANABURY. The boathouse will be built over the seaplane.

Admiral RUSSELL. Which is on Key West property.

(The following information was submitted later:)

Item 1. Aviation fuel storage, $162,000.—This second increment of an aviation jet fuel storage is required to accomplish the fueling requirements for the present and planned jet operations from this station. This will provide for the installation of additional storage tanks for 10,000 barrels of jet fuel together with pumping facilities and pipelines as required to augment the first increment installation.

Item 2. Boathouse—(a) Building (concrete block), $49,000.—A boathouse facility used in conjunction with air-sea rescue operations for the adjacent seaplane landing and takeoff area is required because the present building is in critically poor structural condition and in imminent danger of collapse. It is proposed to raze the old structure and construct a new concrete block structure on the site.

Item 3. Family housing, $1,044,500.—

(*a*) Junior officer (company grade) 1,125 square feet average, 7 each, at $15,200	$106,400
(*b*) Enlisted: 950 square feet average, 73 each, at $12,850	938,100
Total	1,044,500

The 7 MOQ's and 73 MEMQ's are urgently required to alleviate the critical shortage of family housing at this isolated base. There is no reasonable expectancy for increased community support in the foreseeable future. In addition much of the available community support is substandard. The proposed units will be built on Government-owned land.

Captain McHENRY. The items at Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla., were engineered as follows:

Aviation fuel storage: By DFWO 6ND.
Boathouse: PWO NAS Key West.
Family housing: 1 senior officer, 4 junior officers, 15 enlisted men.

NAVAL AUXILIARY LANDING FIELD, MAYPORT, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval auxiliary landing field, Mayport, Fla.," comprised of security road crossovers and fence, communications facilities, aircraft carrier mooring, and family housing. The total request is $812,000 including the family housing as I interpret the mathematics. Is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note at this installation the plant value is $11 million; funded construction not in plant value, $475,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,113,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,113,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $14,023,000.

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Around how much of an area are you going to put the security fence; how many miles are you covering with the fencing?

Captain McKINNEY. We will have 29,500 linear feet, 6-feet high, antipersonnel fence.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you say "security fence" can I interpret that as being chain link?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Captain McHENRY. Six feet high, with guards at the top.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What purpose does this station serve?

Captain McKINNEY. It provides facilities for carrier berth to support the gunnery rocket training. You may recall when we were discussing this seaport facility, it was pointed out that Mayport was the real port for that facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you are removing some fencing. What fencing are you tearing down?

Captain McKINNEY. That is the present existing barbwire fence which has deteriorated beyond economical repair in most places.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That presents an interesting question. Your barbwire does not have the same dipping that the chain-link does, does it?

Captain McHENRY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have something now that salt air attacks, which you would not have with chain-link fence?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir. Barbwire is not generally hot dip galvanized; chain link is.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you consider the life of chain link in that kind of area—20 years, barring accident?

Captain McHENRY. I would say so; yes, sir; 20 years with maintenance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see your housing requirement is not an elaborate one and you have no other comparable housing on that base.

Captain McFARLAND. There is no housing on the base.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Security road crossovers and fence, $149,000.—This provides for the construction of a security fence along the perimeter of the station. It will provide protection from trespassing and enclose the land acquired in the fiscal year 1955 public works program. This item is required for protection from trespassing since the existing barbed-wire fence has deteriorated beyond economical repair in numerous places.

Item 2. Communications facilities, $249,000.—This is for the construction of a remote receiver building in a remote location free from electrical interference for positive control of aircraft operations. Communications with aircraft equipped with ultra high frequency only are especially unreliable without remote receiver facilities and line-of-sight communications. Without this adequate communications for the safe operation of modern aircraft cannot be maintained.

Item 3. Aircraft carrier mooring, $340,000.—

(*a*)	Sheet steel cellular type mooring islands	$236,000
(*b*)	Hydraulic fill	23,000
(*c*)	Pier (10′ x 200′)	22,800
(*d*)	Shore bollards and platforms	28,000
(*e*)	Electric and telephone services	2,400
(*f*)	Water service	13,800
(*g*)	Parking area	5,600
(*h*)	Improve access road (20′ wide)	8,400
		340,000

This provides for the construction of a second aircraft carrier berth in the turning basin. This is an interim measure to relieve an immediate need for more space.

The proposed facility is designed to be incorporated into an expanded permanent facility at a later time.

Item 4. Family housing, $74,000.—

(a) Senior officer (field grade), 1,500 square feet average, 1 each at $20,500	$20,250
(b) Junior officer (company grade), 1,125 square feet average, 1 each at $15,200	15,200
(c) Enlisted, 950 square feet average, 3 each	38,500
Total	74,000

The 2 MOQ and the 3 MEMO are urgently required to alleviate the critical deficiency of family housing at this activity. The drastic change in the mission of this field from a small prewar field with no carrier mooring facilities to a naval auxiliary landing field with a vastly increased mission which provides facilities for carrier berthing and support of jet aircraft has brought about an increase in the number of personnel on board with no provision being made, to date, to provide family housing.

NAVAL AUXILIARY LANDING FIELD, MAYPORT, FLA.

Security fence: DPWO 6ND.
Communication facilities: Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., $800 estimate.
Aircraft carrier mooring: PWO NAS, Jacksonville, Fla.
Family housing: 1 senior officer; 1 junior officer, 3 enlisted men.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item reflected as "Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.," composed of eight subsidiary requirements altogether totaling $4,370,000.

The plant value is $19,144,051; funded construction not in plant value, $12,218,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $4,645,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,645,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $32,530,000.

The largest item that appears there mathematically and dollarwise is that of $2,243,000 reflected as being the second increment in the barracks. What type of construction are those barracks?

Captain MCHENRY. Reenforced concrete frame, concrete floor and roof slabs, built-up roof, unit masonry walls.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Comparable with those already on the station?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With regard to the fueling stations, does that carry the same explanation as the fueling stations you have heretofore testified about?

Captain MCKINNEY. For the high-speed stations. This provides for four permanent high-speed fueling stations, similar to the other.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I find one item that is universally somewhat controversial as to the high cost factor—high because of necessity; that is, the chapel, $332,000. Why would a chapel cost that much?

Captain MCHENRY. The chapel is reinforced concrete frame construction on spread footings, unit masonry, precast frame and panel wall construction. This price at $18.90 a square foot for that type of design we do not consider to be a very high price.

Admiral CLARK. I think the thing that generates the chairman's question is the fact we include collateral. This usually includes a three-way altar, so that they can have Catholic, Jewish, and all-round worship, and for that $20,000 is required.

Captain McKENNEY. This is a 600-seat chapel.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Supply and flammable storage facilities, $563,000.—Existing makeshift space is inadequate and deteriorated beyond economical repair. Lack of space precludes storage of all materials needed and contributes to high percentage of grounded aircraft. Without this the station will be unable to store needed spare parts for the aircraft operations.

Item 2. Combat training tank (50 meter) improvements, $256,000.—This provides for the construction of an enclosure to an existing pool and improvements to the personnel facilities and support utilities. The pool will then be able to provide facilities for training in water survival, helicopter rescue, abandoning ship, and ditching of aircraft.

Item 3. BOQ (50 officers) second increment, $350,000.—This provides for the construction of a BOQ to relieve the existing officer housing situation. The conditions under which some of the bachelor officers stationed at this field are housed are deplorable. Without this project these officers will have to continue to live in substandard, crowded, poorly heated existing temporary BOQ's. This not only affects their morale and desire to remain with the Navy but lowers their efficiency as officers and pilots.

Item 4. Barracks (second increment), $2,432,000.—

(*a*) Buildings, 1,548, men, $1,340	$2,073,300
(*b*) Collateral, 1,548, men, $155	240,000
(*c*) Site work and utilities	118,700
Total	2,432,000

This provides for nine 172-man barracks to replace temporary mobilization type barracks which are substandard, leaky, poorly heated, and have passed their useful life expectancy.

Item 5. Fueling stations (4), $281,000.—This provides for four permanent high-speed fueling stations. It is capable of refueling 8 aircraft at a rate of 400 gallons per minute per aircraft. Fuel consumption rates for modern jet-type aircraft produce a requirement that conventional truck refuelers cannot satisfy in the time necessary for refueling.

Item 6. Steam line, $102,000.—This provides for a steam line to the theater to provide steam heat in place of the existing oil-fired system which should be removed to eliminate expensive maintenance costs and operating personnel. This steam line will also service the infirmary, administration building, welfare and recreational facilities.

Item 7. Road, $50,000.—

(*a*) Road 26 feet wide (6-inch select base), 2,600 L. F. at $9.90	$25,850
(*b*) Road 22 feet wide (6-inch select base), 2,900 L. F. at $8.33	24,150
Total	50,000

This is for an all-weather road from the jet engine shop to the jet engine testing and runup area. The road will also serve as a general access road to the western part of the station. Without it the test area cannot be used during inclement weather as the existing road becomes impassable or unsafe for the transportation of these costly engines. Delays are also encountered when the road is shut down for repairs.

Captain McHENRY. Engineering at naval air station, Miramar, Calif., is as follows:

Supply and storage facilities: Murray Erick, Los Angeles, $5,000.
Combat training tank: Benedict, Beckler & Kocher, Los Angeles, $2,380.
Bachelor officers quarters: R. J. Neutra, Los Angeles, $4,250 (2d increment).
Barracks: S. Clements, Los Angeles, $5,500 (2d increment).
Fueling stations: M. A. Nishkjan & Co., Long Beach, Calif., $1,250 (2d increment).
Steam line: Benedict Beckler & Kocher, Los Angeles, $1,299.
Road: DPWO11ND.
Chapel: R. J. Neutra, Los Angeles, $3,050.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif.," composed of 5 contributing factors that go into your total request of $2,581,000.

At this installation the plant value is $27,118,595; funded construction not in plant value, $3,131,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $6,331,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $6,331,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $57,701,000.

Your largest item is for extension of runway. How much are you extending that runway?

Admiral RUSSELL. Two thousand feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not happen to have a map available of that particular location, do you? The thing I am interested in at the moment is, in extending this runway, what are we going to run into insofar as properties, population, and so forth, at the end of the runway?

Mr. HANABURY. We are extending the runway out over the lower San Francisco Bay, which is all salt marsh.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are not going into the populous area?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; but in the avigation easement program, the $23 million package, there is an item for acquiring land on the other side of the Bayshore Highway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that on the right-hand side, or is it on the lake side?

Mr. HANABURY. I would say the right side looking south, sir. Going south from San Francisco on Bayshore Highway, Moffett Field is on the left. We require four or five hundred acres on the right-hand side of the road.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is back in the other justification?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir; that is in the $23 million package.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about your pipeline; give us a briefing on that requirement.

Captain MCKINNEY. This provides a pipeline to pump jet fuel from the unloading pier to the storage tanks at the air station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you been hauling it in trucks heretofore?

Mr. HANABURY. The approach unloading facility is completed. We now have one pipeline and we want another pipeline.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In reality, this is another increment or addition to your already existing pipeline?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What size pipeline are you putting in?

Mr. HANABURY. Ten-inch.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have a 10-inch line there already, what is the reason for putting in an additional 10-inch line?

Mr. HANABURY. Primarily to handle two different kinds of fuel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Obviously you do the unloading, I presume, sometimes at the same time?

Captain MCKINNEY. We have actually been making truck deliveries for the type of fuel to be delivered by this line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you do not use 1 line to handle 2 types of fuel?

Captain McKINNEY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Heretofore you have been using truck transportation for one type of fuel and now you want to do away with the truck situation and use another pipeline.

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The question has been asked that I think is apropos—why did not you do that at Glynco, Ga.?

Mr. HANABURY. Next year, Mr. Chairman.

Captain McKINNEY. I submit the following for the record:

Item 2. Parachute building, $152,000.—This provides a standard parachute building to meet an urgent need at this station. The building will also provide facilities for maintenance of survival gear such as liferafts, etc. This item will correct inefficient working conditions and unsafe handling of this equipment.

Item 3. Widening taxiway, $380,000.—

(*a*) Site preparation (excavation, subbase, and drainage)	$27,000
(*b*) Paving:	
(1) 11-inch concrete slab with 16-inch base	293,000
(2) Shoulder treatment	7,000
(3) Subbase and select fill	29,000
(*c*) Lighting	24,000
Total	380,000

This is necessary to relieve an overcrowding of the existing pretakeoff holding and engine runup. The delays that are experienced at the takeoff end of the runway, due to the restricted holding areas, disrupt aircraft operations to an unacceptable degree. Without this item the mission of NAS Moffett Field to support assigned aircraft squadrons will be seriously impaired.

Item 4. Extension of runway 32–R, $1,811,000.—

(*a*) Site preparation	$218,000
(*b*) Paving:	
(1) Select fill	946,000
(2) 11-inch concrete slab with 10-inch base	283,000
(3) 2-inch A. C. with 6-inch base	120,000
(4) Shoulders, prime coat, asphalt, numbering, and marking	41,000
(*c*) New fence	18,000
(*d*) Patrol road, 16-foot roadway:	
(1) Select fill	127,000
(2) 2-inch plant mix on 6-inch base	20,000
(*e*) Lighting	38,000
Total	1,811,000

This provides for a 2,000-inch extention of runway 32–R to the north to provide a usable 2,000-foot length as required by present standards. Encroachment on the southern boundary of the field by private construction and the Federal Highway 101 bypass has caused the touchdown point on the approach end of this runway to be moved 2,000 feet from the end in order to comply with the 50–1 glide angle requirement.

Item 5. Relocate compass rose, $50,000.—A compass rose is a standard requirement at every air station. It consists of a concrete apron 120 feet in diameter accessible by means of a taxiway. In the center of the apron is a bronze (nonmagnetic) turntable. The taxiway and apron are designed to support 50,000-pound wheel loadings. Aircraft at this station now make special trips to other air stations for compensating aircraft compasses, since the use of the present rose seriously interferes with normal aircraft operation on the airfield.

Captain McHENRY. Engineering at naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif., is as follows:

Aircraft fuel pipeline: Earl and Wright, San Francisco, $1,200.
Parachute building: Leland S. Rosener, Jr., San Francisco, $1,400.
Widen taxiway: DPWO–12ND.
Extension of runway: DPWO–12ND.
Relocate compass rose: DPWO–12ND.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up next the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., composed of 6 items making a total of $5,260,000.

The plant value is $66,811,710; funded construction not in plant value, $8,785,000; existing unfunded authorization, $1,670,948; the proposed 1956 authorization, $5,260,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $5,260,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $48,595,000.

Your heavy one is at the beginning, "Fuel accessories overhaul and test building," $1,925,000.

Tell us something about that.

Captain McKinney. This item is required to fulfill urgent need for overhaul and test of aircraft and engine fuel controls, pumps, and accessories. The advent of jet engines into the fleet has brought about a need for additional overhaul and test space to accommodate the higher powered, higher flow and higher pressure test equipment.

Mr. Sheppard. I see another item that is quite interesting—"Communication facilities," $906,000. They are composed of what?

Captain McKinney. This is to provide for a remote receiver building and a transmitter building with facilities for the repair and maintenance of teletype machines and radio equipment. The present facilities are located in a badly deteriorated temporary building. Communications with aircraft using very high frequency and ultra-high frequency equipment require line-of-sight transmission for effective operation and the receiver building must be in an isolated location free from electrical interference.

Mr. Sheppard. There are no telephones or switchboards involved in this requirement here?

Admiral Russell. No, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. In the total of these budget requirements have we passed over or are we coming into any facilities where we are putting in telephone switchboards and general communication of that type—not going into other types, but of that specific type?

Captain McKinney. No, sir; nothing except one connecting phone.

Mr. Sheppard. I was talking about a major installation, putting in switchboards, and so forth.

Captain McKinney. No, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Do you have room at Norfolk to put in all of these new requirements? I have always understood Norfolk was a pretty congested area, even some years ago, and this would indicate we are putting a little more in. I am wondering how you are doing it.

Captain McKinney. You will recall that the naval air station is separate from the base.

Mr. Sheppard. So you naturally are going to put this at the naval air station and it will not have to do with the so-called compacted area.

Captain McKinney. Yes, sir. And at this base each station has a shore master plan and for all items, before they are placed, the space is allocated for them on this master plan.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Flight test and transfer buildings, $750,000.—

(*a*) Alterations to 2 buildings	$443,000
(*b*) Plane parking area 10 inches P. C. concrete	185,000
(*c*) Storm drainage	5,000
(*d*) Steam mains	7,000
(*e*) Electrical and telephone	10,000
(*f*) Collateral	100,000
Total	750,000

This facility is the minimum necessary to provide for maintenance on aircraft undergoing flight test or in a status of transfer from, or acceptance by, O. and R. This work is presently accomplished outside or in existing antiquated hangars originally built in 1917 to house dirigibles, relocated in 1932 to their present position for aircraft use. They have become obsolete for emergency repair, besides being too small to accommodate new type planes and lacking necessary shop facilities they are 1 mile away from the airfield and remote from existing O. and R. shops. This facility will eliminate unnecessarily expensive operations under adverse conditions.

Item 2. Explosive decompression chamber building, $68,000—This provides for the construction of a building to house an explosive decompression chamber. This chamber is used to train pilots to overcome the psychological problems involved in instantaneous loss of cockpit pressure at extreme altitudes. Fitting the pilot to the full pressure omnienvironmental suit and training him under simulated conditions in mandatory for flight at 35,000 feet and over.

Item 3. FAETU,[1] *Atlantic, facilities (second increment), $848,000.—*

(*a*) Operational electronics training building:	
1. Building, 12,439 square feet, at $17.90	$223,000
2. Utilities, site preparation, collateral, etc	101,000
Subtotal, O. E. T. building	324,000
(*b*) Airborne electronics system training building:	
1. Building, 11,490 square feet, at $17.04	196,000
2. Utilities, site preparation, collateral, etc	85,000
Subtotal, A. E. S. T. building	281,000
(*c*) FAETULANT administration building:	
1. Building, 11,490 square feet, at $15.52	178,000
2. Utilities, site preparation, collateral, etc	65,000
Subtotal, FAETULANT administration building	243,000
Total, FAETU facilities	848,000

This is for five buildings to care for the increased student load now needed and to provide facilities for the installation of the complex bulky electronics equipment required for training pilots and technicians in the latest type of operational developments. With this NAS, Norfolk will be able to provide the facilities for this type of training. New equipment is already available that cannot be used without a training building to house it.

Item 4. Bombing targets, including land acquisition, $763,000.

1. Bombing target, Pamlico Sound, N. C.:	
(*a*) Observation tower 30 feet high with generator building	$17,940
(*b*) 2 Observation towers 30 feet high without generator building	26,700
(*c*) Barracks subsistence and shop building	25,200
(*d*) Utilities:	
Water supply, 15-man sewage disposal, 25 kilowatts electric power and 35,000 lf. submarine cable	35,280
(*e*) Small boat pier 100 x 10 feet wood deck on piles	13,680
(*f*) Collateral equipment	13,200
(*g*) Land acquisition	1,000
Subtotal	133,000

[1] Fleet airborne electronics training unit.

2. Bombing target, Albemarle Sound, N. C.:	
(a) Modification of Government-owned surplus ferry barge for use as target	$3,200
(b) Steel framework, target 18 x 30 feet pile supported	25,600
(c) Alterations to existing huts	1,200
Subtotal	30,000
3. Bombing target, Parramore Island, Va.:	
(a) Acquisition of land and improvements:	
(1) Acquisition in fee, 7,000 acres, at $28.70	$200,000
(2) Acquisition of improvements	100,000
(b) 3 buoys markers and 2 fixed markers	19,000
(c) Targets	86,000
(d) Buildings:	
(1) 3 huts, elevated 30 feet	12,000
(2) 1 hut elevated 30 feet	6,000
(3) 1 hut	4,000
(e) Rehabilitate existing storage shed, garage, and shop	5,000
(f) Rehabilitate buildings for barracks and mess	17,000
(g) Generator building: (1) 10-kilowatt generator	3,000
(h) Utility building: (1) Boiler, well, and pump, 15-kilowatt generator and 10-kilowatt generator	15,300
(i) Roads (8 feet wide dirt): (1) Grading and improving	10,300
(j) Clearing	20,800
(k) Utilities: Heating pipe 178 linear feet, water pipe 263 linear feet, electrical line 490 linear feet, telephone line (on poles 12,116 linear feet) and septic tank and field	35,500
(l) Fuel storage	5,800
(m) Collateral	11,000
(n) Technical collateral: (Radio transmitter, receiver, and antennae)	6,000
Subtotal	600,000
Total	763,000

Three targets are urgently required for training carrier pilots, based in the Norfolk area, in the delivery of special weapons by newly developed bombing techniques. Provision is also made for conventional dive bombing, strafing, and rocket firing. Without these targets, air groups going aboard carriers from this area will not be trained in the weapons they are expected to use. Detailed budget justification for this project is included in the classified portion of this program.

NAVAL AIR STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

Fuel accessories overhaul building: Gilboy & O'Malley, Scranton, Pa., $30,000. and Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va., $952.

Flight test and transfer building: Lublin, McGaughy & Associates, Norfolk, Va., $17,800.

Explosive decompression chamber: Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va., $1,088.

Communication facilities: Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va., $3,037.

Fleet air electronics training unit facility: Lublin, McGaughy & Associates, Norfolk, Va., $5,300.

Bombing targets including land acquisition: L. E. Wooten & Co., Raleigh, N. C., $3,250,[1] and Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va., $1,768.[2]

NAVAL AIR STATION, OCEANA, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will proceed to the next item, "Naval air station at Oceana, Va.," composed of 8 subsidiary requirements making a total monetary request of $5,281,000.

I call your specific attention to item 6 under subhead 3, "Bombing target," Parramore Island, Va., where the total request for funds is $600,000.

[1] North Carolina area.
[2] Virginia area.

I would like to ask at this point what authority you have for this island and what is the general situation pertaining to this project?

Admiral CLARK. We have a House report which recommends authorization to purchase this island; we have seen a copy of the Senate subcommittee's report which does not include this item. That is the status of the authorization at the present time.

Three things should be invited to your attention. First, the acquisition of a bombing target in this area is brought on by a requirement for space and a small amount of land to conduct a new type of bombing, which I would like to tell you about off the record later; second, we need this near the Norfolk Oceana complex because of the large number of pilots that need this training; third, is the discussion of why we want this particular land and why we picked it.

You will see from the chart that is the black line with two red spots on it. That is a sand spit owned by two people, a man and his sister. Neither one of them live on the island. There is a little Coast Guard station at one end of it. The distance between there and the mainland is about 2½ to 3 miles, and the distance to the nearest town is about 4 miles, as I remember. The intent in this type of bombing which I will tell you about off the record——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before you go further, is there any land transportation available as of now between the island and the mainland; is there any causeway or anything of that character?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; nothing except fishing boats go in there, and so forth.

Now our approaches for this type of bombing will be from the seaward and the nearest one that comes to the land is the one that comes parallel from the southwest over the marshland, and we will not continue our bombing runs over the mainland.

Furthermore, it is not intended to drop any live ammunition. We are going to drop little shaped charges that have the same ballistic or falling characteristics through the air as a regular bomb would have, but in which we will have a cartridge which will make a little smoke, but will not endanger lives.

(Discussion off the record.)

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will continue this morning the item entitled "Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.," wherein you have a total request for $5,281,000, comprising 8 items.

The plant value is $19,745,110; funded construction not in plant value, $17,506,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $7,326,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $7,326,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $23,352,000.

I wish you would present your justifications at this point in the record and I ask specific emphasis with reference to the second item for $1,287,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is for bachelor officers' quarters with subsistence facilities and it is to take care of the new station at Oceana, which is the major jet station for the Norfolk Complex. The present

BOQ is a substandard temporary building constructed during World War II and does not satisfy the minimum fire safety standards and is not worth repairing. This BOQ will satisfy part of the deficiency of the planned 501 officer complement at this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I suppose this presentation is premised upon the same generalities as those of like character you have testified to heretofore; is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

(The following was submitted later.)

OCEANA

Item 1 is for three 172-man barracks for which we are requesting $850,000. This is the third increment for barracks at this station where there is a need to house 2,234 enlisted men for which there is an existing deficit of 668. Personnel are presently being quartered in badly deteriorated prefabricated temporary World War II wooden structures which are located about 6 miles from their working areas.

Item 2 is for a bachelor officer quarters with subsistence facilities for which we are requesting $1,287,000. BOQ and messing facilities will be required for 250 officers at this station. The present BOQ is a substandard temporary building constructed during World War II. It does not satisfy minimum fire safety standards and is so badly deteriorated that it is not worth repairs.

Item 3 is for aircraft parking apron for which we are requesting $821,000. Additional parking area is required to accommodate the 171 additional aircraft planned for assignment to this station. This is the third increment of this item.

Item 4 is for supply facilities in the amount of $924,000. This includes a warehouse and office space for the supply department. Oceana is a secondary stocking point and this building is needed to store the complete range of spare parts in quantities sufficient to meet the needs of the fleet units based there.

Item 5 is for public works facilities consisting of maintenance shops and office space for which we are requesting $478,000. This is part of the planned build up of this station and will involve the abandonment of the temporary and unsatisfactory facilities at the old station about 6 miles distant.

Item 6 is for a standard gymnasium for a station of the size for which we are requesting $288,000. This gymnasium is required to provide indoor physical training facilities for the 3,693 military personnel complement of this station and the fleet units based thereon. The only facilities available is a temporary World War II structure located on the north station which is 6 miles distant.

Item 7 is for a chapel of 600 seat capacity at an estimated cost of $241,000. Services are currently being held in other buildings since the survey has indicated that the existing chapel is structurally unsafe because of dry rot.

Item 8 is for 4 high-speed fueling stations with associated piping and day tank. This is a second increment and will provide facilities for refueling 8 aircraft at a rate of 400 gallons per minute per plane. The estimated cost of this item is $392,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has this facility been engineered; if so, by whom, when, and how much?

Captain MCHENRY. That particular facility has been engineered by Hays, Seay, Mattern & Mattern.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the cost of this survey in this instance you will insert as you have in the past.

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

(The information is as follows:)

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.

Barracks		DPWO, 5ND.
Bachelor officers quarters and mess Aircraft parking apron Supply facility Public works facility Gymnasium Chapel Fueling stations	Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Norfolk, Va.	$39,000 (estimated).

NAVAL AIR STATION, QUONSET POINT, WASHINGTON COUNTY, R. I.

Quonset Point, Washington County, R. I.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Washington County, R. I.," wherein you are making a request for $1,062,000 composed of three items. I note at this installation the plant value is $73,601,757; funded construction not in plant value, $8,806,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,062,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,062,000 and the estimated future appropriation required, $57,887,000.

Make your presentation for the bombing targets, wherein $572,000 is requested.

Captain MCKINNEY. This bombing target is required in connection with the bombing technique which was explained to the committee, and the target will be set up in No Man's Land Island, which is about 7 miles southwest of Marthas Vineyard Island. There is no activity within about 10 miles of this station. It is all on Government-owned land and there is no land acquisition required.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the requirement for this naval station predicated upon the same policy procedure that heretofore has been defined?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir; this is one of our permanent naval air stations.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Composite approach lighting, $115,000.—This provides for the construction of approach lighting at the end of the instrument runway to bridge the gap between ground control approach (GCA) guidance and runway lighting guidance for use in inclement weather and at night. This gap is presently a vital weak link in an instrument approach. A hazardous situation exists during instrument landings which will be corrected by this item.

Item 2. Central heating plant modification, $375,000.—This provides for the installation of fuel oil storage facilities and the replacement or modification of the existing steam piping so that the full capacity of all installed boilers can be used. There is a requirement for the full boiler capacity during peak loads.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this particular requirement been engineered, Captain; if so, by whom, at what time, and the cost?

Captain MCHENRY. It was engineered by the district public works officer of the First Naval District during the past 6 months, and the cost was absorbed as a Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And these requirements are predicated upon the same information as those heretofore inquired into?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. What about item (*b*) under item 3, "3-mile gravel road and 2-mile telephone line"? Do you have a breakdown of that total of $123,292? Is that a private line?

Major FENTON. Out on this island, that will be a telephone line to interconnect the rake stations and the headquarters where the radio station is, so that we will have control of the pilots while they are making their target practice runs. It will be tied in with the target work.

Admiral CLARK. By rake stations, he means observation stations, so that they can observe the flight of the bombs they are going to drop and tie it into 1 source and that 1 control place will control the run of the plane, tell them when they can start the runs, the errors in timing they made on the last run, and why. This is a wholly Government-owned island with nothing on it but our own telephone system, and this is the estimate that has been worked out.

Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item, "Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.," wherein you are making a request for $3,556,000. I note at this installation the plant value is $68,550,637; funded construction not in plant value, $2,734,000; existing unfunded authorization, $808,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,748,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,556,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $86,955,000.

This is composed of seven subdivisions, and is required upon the same premise as those of like character you have heretofore presented?

Captain McKinney. That is correct.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1 is for an explosive decompression chamber at an estimated cost of $50,000. This equipment is essential to familiarize pilots with the sensation and the equipment and techniques to be used when their cockpit suddenly loses its pressure while flying at extremely high altitudes.

Item 2 is for an oxygen and carbon dioxide bottle testing and charging building for which we are requesting $282,000. This facility is required to meet the oxygen and carbon dioxide needs of this station. A standard 514 cubic inch airborne oxygen cylinder will supply 1 man 4 hours under normal conditions. Safety regulations require these cylinders to be refilled after each flight regardless of duration. A recent survey conducted by the Fire Prevention Division disclosed that the existing shop constituted a potential fire and explosive hazard. The old shop will be utilized for badly needed storage space.

Item 3 is a special weapons training facility for which we are requesting $1,709,000. This item provides for a building to consolidate and house the facilities required to meet the increased demands in special weapons training. This facility will provide a permanent training building with the necessary security protection for the special weapons training unit of the Pacific Fleet. It is in consonance with the master shore station development plan.

Item 4 is for aviation refueler facility at an estimated cost of $267,000. This will provide truck fill stands and equipment for aviation gasoline and jet fuel refueler loading facilities.

Item 5 is for the reconstruction of a steam tunnel for $144,000. The existing tunnel was installed 25 years ago and has failed due to moisture attacking the side walls and reinforcements. The portion under the streets is failing under the heavy wheel load of present day traffic.

Item 6 is for the safety modification of building 306 (aircraft painting shop) for which we are requesting $296,000. This includes the installation of sparkproof floor covering, vaporproof lights and improved ventilation. This facility has long been recognized as potentially injurious to the health of personnel and a dangerous fire hazard by district and station safety personnel.

Item 7 is for the modernization and improvement of the existing utilities system in the amount of $808,000. This item was originally authorized in Public Law 155, 82d Congress, and provides for the modification and improvement of utility systems installed as early as 1920.

Mr. Sheppard. Has this been engineered, Captain; if so, by whom, at what time, and what was the cost?

Captain McHenry. Items 1, 5 and 6 were engineered by the district public works officer of the 11th Naval District. Items 2 and 3 were engineered by Wilson & Wilson, Engineers, Los Angeles, Calif., for $14,000. Item 4 was engineered by J. W. Montgomery & Co., of Los Angeles, for $7,736.

Special Weapons Training Facility

Mr. Sheppard. I would like a very definite justification of the third item for $1,709,000 under the title "Special weapons training facility."

Captain McKINNEY. This is to provide a building to consolidate the existing training facilities into one space in order to meet the demands of the fleet for special weapons training. This is the center of the special weapons training unit for the Pacific Fleet and this special weapons training is in connection with guided missiles and special ordnance equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this is part of your requirement under your expansion program and is justified in proportion to your justification of projects heretofore reviewed by the committee; is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions upon this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Captain McKINNEY. I might point out that we have one item where we are merely requesting funding authority, item 7, which was authorized under Public Law 155 of the 82d Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is modifying your already-existing safety characteristics?

Captain McKINNEY. It is a modification and renewal of utilities, some of which were laid down as early as 1920, and also to tie it in with the new construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has it been put together in increments heretofore, or is this just a year-by-year procedure?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How essential is it to the total program?

Captain McKINNEY. It is very essential, because the present utility system is very badly deteriorated and this will tie in with the new construction at this station.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, SANFORD, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item reflected as "Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.," wherein you are making a request for $188,900.

I note at this installation the plant value is $9,344,198; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $188,900; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $188,900; and the estimated future appropriation required, $40,600,000.

This is reflected as family housing, to provide 2 for senior officers, 3 for junior officers, and 8 enlisted quarters. Is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir—for a total of 13 at a cost of $188,900. These are required to alleviate a critical deficiency in family housing at this station. This station is about 108 miles south of Jacksonville, Fla., and the Jacksonville complex.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Family housing

(*a*) Senior officers (field grade), 1,500 square feet (average), 2	$40,500
(*b*) Junior officers (company grade), 1,125 square feet (average), 3	45,600
(*c*) Enlisted, 950 square feet (average), 8	102,800
Total (13)	188,900

The 5 MOQ and 8 MEMQ's are urgently required to alleviate the critical deficiency of family housing at this station. This station was used as a World War II training base and no provision was made for permanent facilities. It is now an

operational station. There are only two sets of substandard public quarters on the station and no expectation of increased community support in the foreseeable future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this requirement been engineered, Captain; if so, by whom, when and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. It has not been engineered. The estimates were established from criteria given to us by the Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And will be engineered in accordance with projects of like character.

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before contracts are issued, you will submit the engineering cost that may be up or down to what is presented before the committee; is that correct?

Captain MCHENRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No question.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, WEEKSVILLE, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval Air Station, Weeksville, N. C.," composed of 1 cold-storage building and 1 vehicle-pool building and reflecting a total request of $342,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $8,024,503; funded construction not in plant value, $568,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $342,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $342,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,688,000.

Present your requirement for the vehicle-pool building.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is at Weeksville, which is about 40 miles south of Norfolk, and is a vehicular pool for the Bureau of Aeronautics, for their special vehicle equipment which must be maintained in immediate ready-for-issue condition for the Marine and Naval Air Forces under emergency conditions. This building is designed to house this equipment and get it out of the weather. We have no existing facility for the purpose.

Item 1. Cold storage building at a cost of $52,000.—This involves the rehabilitation of a portion and an addition to an existing messhall to provide the required refrigerated storage space to support the 1,243 personnel on board this station. The present facility has a 1 day supply for 800 men and is entirely inadequate.

Item 2. Vehicle-pool building for which we are requesting $290,000.—The Bureau of Aeronautics utilizes this station for the storage, repair, and distribution of automotive and special vehicles which must be maintained in ready for issue condition to support Marine and Naval forces in emergencies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it to be used for purposes other than that of maintaining a mobilization reserve stock?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir, and also to be used as a maintenance building to maintain this equipment in proper operating condition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this item been engineered; if so, by whom, at what time, and the cost thereof?

Captain MCHENRY. Item 1, the cold storage building, was engineered by Hays Seay Mattern & Matter, of Roanoke, Va., during the past six months for $1,500.

Item 2, the vehicle pool building, was engineered by L. E. Wooten & Co., of Raleigh, N. C., during the past 6 months for $2,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the type of building under Item 2?

Captain MCHENRY. Machine and engine loft area, 52 feet by 137; parts and tool and woodworking shop, 142 by 117 feet, making a total of 13,000 feet. The construction will be steel frame exterior and steel and masonry interior.

NAVAL AIR STATION, WHIDBEY ISLAND, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.," composed of four items for a total request in money of $1,958,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $46,418,050; funded construction not in plant value, $15,220,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,212,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,212,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $34,385,000.

I wish you would give us an explanation of two items there. The first one for $710,000 has to do with aircraft parking area, and the second one of $810,000 has to do with land acquisition for construction. I would like specific details on the land-acquisition requirement.

Captain MCKINNEY. Item 2, "Aircraft parking area," for which the request is $710,000, will provide replacement for about 50,000 square yards of defective pavement. The existing pavement was laid down in 1942 and is not thick enough for present modern heavy patrol planes landing on that runway.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Composite approach lighting, $138,000.—This is for the construction of approach lighting at the end of the instrument runway to bridge the gap between ground control approach (GCA) guidance and runway lighting guidance for use in inclement weather and at night. This gap is a weak link in instrument approach. A hazardous situation exists during instrument landings which will be corrected by the accomplishment of this item.

Item 2. Aircraft parking area, $710,000.

Item 3. Combat training tank, $300,000.—This provides for the construction of an indoor training pool with special training devices; i. e., dilbert dunker, P2V dunker, helicopter sling rescue from water, parachute harness release, and abandon ship drill scaffold. The item is required to furnish the pilots and aircrewmen stationed at NAS Whidbey Island needed survival training.

Item 4. Land acquisition for construction.—

(*a*)	Area "A" with improvements, lump sum	$337,000
(*b*)	Area "B" with improvements, lump sum	473,000
	Total	810,000

This is for the acquisition of a parcel of land bounded by the waters of Rosario Strait and surrounded on the other three sides by the station and for the acquisition of a parcel of land needed for the construction of an AUW shop. The station must have control over the development of the first parcel, which is needed for future planned expansion of the station, and at present there is no place for locating the required AUW shop.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the pavement already in existence in that area; are you going in and tear up the old pavement and put in new, or are you going to lay the new pavement on top of the old?

Captain MCHENRY. If the runway is to be located in the first place, we just overlay it and retain what is there and strengthen it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered; if so by whom, at what date and cost?

Captain McHENRY. We have 4 items under this line item and have 4 different architect engineers: Composite Approach Lighting, Walter S. Gordon, Tacoma, Wash., $1,850; Aircraft Parking Area, Heath, Hammond, Collier Association, Seattle, Wash., $4,000; Combat Training Tank, Leo A. Daly Co., Seattle, Wash., $2,500; Land Acquisition was done by the District Public Works Officer of the 13th Naval District, Seattle, Wash.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before we leave that, give me the explanation of the land acquisition.

Captain McKINNEY. Item 4 is land acquisition for a total of $810,000. I will ask Mr. Tiencken, from the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to answer that.

Admiral CLARK. This island is completely surrounded by Government land.

Mr. HANABURY. The existing runways on Whidbey Island are shown here colored in blue; the existing station is the area here and the station (pointing) is shown on the crosshatched area. We propose in this program to acquire three parcels, parcel A, which is entirely surrounded by Government land, a portion of which is practically in the middle of our building area. Parcel B is to construct a classified project, and parcel C is the approach to the ocean.

This is the existing runway and the new runway will be built here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. And according to the justifications, for area A with improvements you are asking $337,000 and for area B with improvements, $473,000.

What are the privately owned properties presently located in area B?

Mr. HANABURY. There are several farm dwellings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they all farming properties in there?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the largest farming property in there?

Mr. HANABURY. I do not have that indicated on the map.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What kind of farming is it—dairy farming, or what?

Mr. HANABURY. Dairy farming.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is area C?

Mr. HANABURY. Area C is the approach which is wooded. This area of ground goes upward and this is timberland up here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the contemplated cost of it?

Mr. HANABURY. Area C is in the $23 million package for aviation easements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is to appear in your budget requirements?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is why we do not find them here.

Mr. HANABURY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the properties located on other portions of the land?

Mr. HANABURY. They are farm properties and some beachfront property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they dairy properties, the same as the others?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir, dairy properties which are closer to the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What did you say the total acreage was in A?

Mr. HANABURY. 460 acres, plus or minus.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And what do you figure the acreage is in B?

Mr. HANABURY. 725 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not see reflected here any acreage cost. You have it reflected here in total. Why did not you have it in acreage cost as you have set up the sum previously? What are you paying an acre for it?

Mr. HANABURY. $475 an acre in area A and $250 in area B.

Admiral CLARK. Area A is waterfront property and is a little more expensive.

OUTLYING FIELD, WHITEHOUSE FIELD, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.," composed of two items, land acquisition and lengthening of runways, wherein you are asking for a total of $1,087,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $800,000; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,766,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,776,000 and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,766,000.

I wish you would address yourself to the land acquisition request.

Captain MCKINNEY. The land acquisition is 900 acres at about $55 an acre, for a total of $50,000, for land necessary to construct an extension to the landing way in order that this field may carry out its mission in support of field carrier landing practice.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Land acquisition required for runway extensions—(a) Land acquisition (fee), 900 acres, $50,000.—This provides for the acquisition of 900 acres of land necessary for runway construction so that this field will be able to support field carrier landing practice.

Item 2. Lengthen runways (resurface 2 existing 3,500-foot runways and extend each to 8,000 feet), $1,037,000.—This provides for the lengthening of 2 runways to 8,000 feet and the construction of attendant operational facilities required to provide adequate and safe operational support for jet aircraft presently stationed at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field. This item is required so that OLF Whitehouse can be used for jet carrier landing practice.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present runway length?

Mr. HANABURY. 5,000 feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you are extending it to what?

Mr. HANABURY. 8,000 feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have to go over and resurface any of the old runway at all?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And widen it?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir. This will be one of the outlying fields of the carrier landing fields for Cecil Field at Jacksonville Complex, used primarily for field carrier landing practice, with the minimum number of buildings on the field and leveling everything around the general runway area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing with the present "Operations building" where you are only requesting $13,500? What is that, a modification, or what?

Mr. HANABURY. That will just be a small building which will house a few people who are there to supervise the field carrier landing practice operations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What did you say the total personnel was to be attached to this field?

Captain MCKINNEY. 2 officers and 25 enlisted men.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered; if so, by whom, at what time and cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The project was engineered by the district public works officer of the 6th Naval District within the past 6 months at Government cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY AIR STATION, BEAUFORT, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.," composed of 13 subdivisions for a total request of $7,274,600. I note at this installation the plant value is $4,246,000; funded construction not in plant value, $12,370,000; existing unfunded authorization, $320,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $5,094,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $7,719,600; and the estimated future appropriation required, $32,556,000. Pick up the first item, $1,918,000 "Extension and strengthening of runway." This is a station of quite some existence time-wise, meaning by that that it is a rather old station, is it not?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. It was reactivated in 1952 and this was authorized to handle a new Third Marine Air Wing. It was authorized to support the Third Marine Division. This is an additional wing authorized for the Marine Corps.

It was originally planned to establish this station in Miami, Fla. However, the density of air traffic down there would not permit the installation of this large group; so we are building it at Beaufort so that we can move the Third Marine Air Wing into Beaufort and relieve the congestion down at Miami.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of a total of 13 subprojects shown at Beaufort, how many are new, starting right from the top?

Captain MCKINNEY. Actually Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress authorized the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station at Beaufort. It provided for aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, administrative and community facilities, open and covered storage and fuel storage facilities, utilities, security facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and land acquisition, in the amount of $11,096,000. So that this, really you might say, is the second increment of the buildup of this station.

This first item is for the extension of runways and this is to widen the runways and lengthen the existing 5,000-foot runways to 8,000 feet with an additional runway and taxi lighting. The two 8,000-foot runways are oriented with the prevailing wind and are essential for the safety of jet aircraft operation, and this is to provide a second cross-wind runway.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 2. Communication facilities, $326,000.—This is to place this radio equipment in a remote location free from electrical interferences for positive control of aircraft operations. Communications with aircraft equipped with UHF only are especially unreliable without remote receiver and transmitter facilities. Unless this is provided adequate communications for the safe operation of modern aircraft cannot be maintained.

Item 3. Navigation aids, $105,000.—This is to provide the minimum navigation aids for safe operation of modern aircraft during hours of darkness and when instrument flight conditions exist. The item is required to safely meet present operational requirements.

Item 4. Fueling stations and POL handling, $1,110,000.—This is to furnish adequate fuel storage for 10 days jet fuel (20,000 barrels underground storage), 4 duplex high speed refueling station and fuel handling facilities. The fuel handling facilities will include fuel barge unloading equipment, required pumps, piping and fire fighting equipment. $320,000 of the required amount represents authority granted for the first increment last year.

Item 5. Compass rose, $77,000.—This is to furnish adequate facilities for compass calibration on aircraft based at this field. To maintain navigation standards all aircraft compasses must be calibrated every 100 hours of aircraft operation, or every 3 months. Without this facility it will be impossible to properly calibrate the compasses.

Item 6. Boresighting range, $49,000.—This is to provide facilities for boresighting the guns and gunsights of the fighter and attack aircraft at this station. Experience dictates checking of the sights of all combat aircraft after each 60 hours of operations. The item is necessary to maintain the accuracy of the sights with relation to the guns.

Item 7. Targets (air to ground) and land acquisition

(*a*) Target construction, etc	$50,000
(*b*) Land acquisition, 7,700 acres	52,000
Total	102,000

This is to provide uninhabitated land and construct targets required for pilot training in strafing, bombing and rocket firing. The facility will be used for 50 or more sorties per day. The Air units based at this station will use this item to maintain the high state of readiness required to insure effective combat operations.

Item 8. Land acquisition.—(*a*) Land, 2,300 acres, $626,000. The land is needed for construction of various facilities required for the development of this station. The new land will provide natural water boundaries on the south and east sides of the station, eliminating need for a portion of security fence and for relocation of a road, affecting a savings totaling about $365,000.

Item 9. Marine Air Control Squadron storage, $119,000.—This is to provide urgently required covered storage for combat packages ranging from basic housekeeping equipment to intricate electronics equipment for the Marine Air Control Squadron. It must be immediately available for issue. Assigned equipment, valued at $8 million, is presently being stored out of doors and cannot be maintained ready for combat operations.

Item 10. Recreation facilities (outdoors), $87,000.—This is to provide outdoor athletic facilities to keep Marine Corps personnel physically fit and alert. The station is 5 miles from the nearest town and recreational facilities are urgently required on this station.

Item 11. Enlisted men's club, $210,000.—This is to provide enlisted men with recreational facilities which are an essential part of every station for use during off-duty hours. No such facilities exist at or in the vicinity of the station.

Item 12. Commissioned officers' mess, $240,000.—This is for indoor recreational facilities for use by the commissioned officers during their off-duty hours. There are no such facilities at the station or in the area. Due to the remote location of this station this project is urgently required.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What proportion of the functions will you get with the appropriation requested, if you should get the full $7 million appropriation requested here, in order to complete the authorization if it is determined to be necessary to complete the authorization?

Captain MCKINNEY. Everything we have in this program we intend to fund this year.

We have an estimated appropriation for future requirements of $32 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not authorized.

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you will absorb your total authorization if these funds are secured?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. We are gradually phasing these people into Beaufort. This is a large activity. The ultimate officer personnel here will be 1,227, and the enlisted 7,896.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you call this an auxiliary operation when in fact it has all of the dollar appearances of being primary?

Captain DAWSON. This is just the initial stages. As the facilities are built up, it will become actually our main station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not in general terms auxiliary as such; it is merely being constructed and it is intended to change, I presume, the original conditions of that particular station.

Captain DAWSON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we should not interpret "auxiliary" as being distinguished from the main project?

Captain DAWSON. No, sir. This is to become the main project and the complex will build up.

Admiral CLARK. We have not changed the designation, because we have not done enough work to make it fall under the classification of a main station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project had its separate contribution as to engineering; if so, by whom, at what time and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. All of the items in this project have been planned by Maurice A. Connell, of Miami, Fla., during the past 6 months, with the exception of the housing item. Costs are as follows:

Extend and strengthen runway and taxiway, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	$7,300
Communications facilities, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	5,600
Navigation aids, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	1,280
Fueling stations and POL facilities, $320,000 authorized by Public Law 534, 83d Cong., M. Connell, Miami, Fla	5,000
Compass rose, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	610
Boresight range, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	968
Targets air to ground, including land acquisition DPWO	No cost
Land acquisition DPWO	No cost
Marine air control squadron storage, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	7,220
Recreation facilities, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	600
Enlisted men's club, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	2,500
Commissioned officers mess, M. Connell, Miami, Fla	2,490
Family housing, 1 senior officer, 21 junior officers, 153 enlisted men	

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have one 5,000-foot runway at the present time?

Major FENTON. We have this runway completed at the present time. This is 8,000 feet. This runway we are proposing in this program will give us a cross-runway of 8,000 feet, which will give us two 8,000-foot runways which are required to operate jets in this area. Because of the winds, and so forth, we require two runways along the Atlantic coast.

•

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, CHERRY POINT, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.," composed of nine subdivisions for which you are making a total request of $3,012,000.

The plant value is $71,924,000; funded construction not in plant value, $8,603,000; existing unfunded authorization, $1,250,000; the

proposed 1956 authorization, $1,782,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,032,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $41,139,000.

This, of course, is a rather old establishment; is it not?

Captain McKINNEY. It was established in 1942.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice your heavy item is reflected as "Final finishing facility," authorized by Public Law 155 of the 82d Congress, for which you are asking $1,250,000. What are you doing?

Captain McKINNEY. The following material will supply that information:

Item 1. Improve docks, $347,000.—This is required to provide docking space to accomodate one 208-foot fuel barge, two 100-foot cargo barges, 1 salvage boat, 3 crash boats, 1 tunnel screw boat and 1 loading craft personnel ramp boat. The existing docks are unsafe for normal use and must be replaced for efficient and timely station operation.

Item 2. Visual omnidirectional range, $73,000.—This facility is required for safe navigation and control of aircraft in all-weather flight operation.

Item 3. Composite approach lighting, $132,000.—This is to install a composite approach lighting system 3,000 feet long off the end of runway 32. This system is urgently required to bridge the gap between the ground-control approach guidance and runway lighting guidance. Without this facility all-weather flying and ground-controlled approaches are subjected to a hazard which increases the possibilities of crashes.

Item 4. Aircraft parking area, $64,000.—This is to pave an area at the east corner of overhaul and repair department building No. 137, and will include tie-downs for anchoring aircraft. This parking area will provide the overhaul and repair department with adequate working space.

Item 5. Ammunition unloading platform and railroad siding, $162,000.—The acquisition of land from the North Carolina Pulp Co. is needed for the railroad track. This project is required to permit the relocation of this facility into an area which will comply with the Department of Defense safety requirements.

Item 6. Relocation of high explosive magazines (4), $144,000.—Relocation of high explosive magazines is required to meet safety distance criteria set forth by the Bureau of Ordnance.

Item 7. Flight test and emergency repair facility, $650,000.—This is needed to provide facilities for maintenance on aircraft undergoing flight test and emergency repair by the O. & R. This work is presently being accomplished in the open. Present operations are divided due to lack of suitable hangar and shop facilities within the O. & R. in which to perform the required services, and unnecessarily expensive and inefficient operations through work stoppages and ineffective utilization of working personnel result.

Item 8. Bombing targets including easements, $190,000.—Detailed budget justification for this project is included in the classified portion of this program.

Item 9. Final finishing facility, $1,250,000.—This is to construct a final finish hangar to be used by the operation and regulation. This building will be of steel and masonry construction and is to include suitable ventilation, lighting accessory utilities and equipment. This is required to provide ventilation and lighted space in which to perform final finish painting of completely assembled aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean it is too small to handle the workload that is presently or is going to be required at this particular station?

Captain McKINNEY. It will accommodate small planes, but will not handle the transport planes which are being assigned to this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, are you enlarging the present building, or leaving it alone to accommodate the type of planes it will accommodate, and building a new one to take care of the larger planes? Which of the two procedures?

Captain McKINNEY. This is the construction of a new building. It will be of steel and masonry construction with suitable ventilation to meet the safety requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why are you planning to relocate the high explosive magazines? What has occurred to cause that difference in shifting of the geographical location?

Major FENTON. Those magazines present a hazardous condition in that area. We wish to move and get a different approach for this runway before some aircraft falls in this magazine area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice under the item for ammunition unloading platform and railroad siding is land acquisition. Is that a contributing part of the relocation of the magazines?

Major FENTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the distance from the present point to where they are now located?

Major FENTON. From the loading point to where they are located?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the new requirement?

Major FENTON. The planned location is that established by the people in the Bureau of Ordnance in accordance with the criteria in the vicinity of 1,500 feet of the magazines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In general, on the policy of creating unloading facilities and that of your storage facilities, is the thought and engineering technique to keep those roads from your point of acceptance to your point of storage separate from the internal part of the operation?

Major FENTON. That is one of the main reasons for relocating this. The present railroad runs right through the base, through the supply facilities, of the public works and up through the housing area which is definitely a hazard to everyone. This new one will come off the main railroad in a desert area where there is no housing and nobody living and will make an isolated area where it should be located.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that is in addition to the present trackage you have for other distribution purposes; is that correct?

Major FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is all of the new ammunition function, wherein we have to change the location, engineered by the same technique? In other words, we are trying to avoid exposure to the populated areas of the base?

Captain DAWSON. Yes, sir; the engineering is in accordance with the clearance standards established by the Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That does not answer my question. What I am trying to determine is, where we have ammunition picked up at A and disposed of at B, which may be 2 miles or 3 miles from 1 point to another, is there any specific attention being paid to exposure all through the center of population on the base, as against that of avoiding it as much as possible?

Mr. HANABURY. We analyze all projects in that same light. For instance, we reviewed one earlier, Brunswick, Maine, for an ammunition loading project, and we had a condition there where we actually had to evacuate 2 or 3 sets of family quarters on the station, and Brunswick has been engineered to the correct situation. We are doing that in all cases where it is physically possible to do so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you do not have final responsibility, what particular efforts do you make to safeguard the population?

Admiral CLARK. We have guards who actually in some cases have to reroute the traffic. Coming ashore, when any ammunition truck is going by, there is no heavy traffic on the same road. Actually, if it simply goes down the road, we do not necessarily have to reroute it.

In the marshaling area, you might call it, where the trucks have to come in, we have a segregation and barricaded siding for those trucks and they are checked out so that only a small number go down the road at one time. But it is not physically possible for us to give permanent protection, any more than you can to ammunition trucks that arrive and sometimes have to go through cities. But they do have local regulations, local police with specific orders to clear traffic and see that no accidents occur to that truck en route.

Captain McKINNEY. And they are properly marked and police assigned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The question has been raised some time ago about population exposure in the military transportation of explosives over a period of considerable mileage. In other words, taking this as a parallel and where it does not necessarily apply, assume you are picking up a load of high explosives at San Francisco and it became necessary to ship it to a vicinity adjacent to Los Angeles; a lot of that hauling work is done by contract trucking firms and what thought, if any, is given to selecting routes to avoid municipalities?

Admiral CLARK. I believe we would get a more definitive and correct answer if we waited until the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance appears before you later; because he controls that all over the country and is more familiar with it than I am. I do know, of course, these contractors must comply with the different State and local laws upon the subject, but I believe the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance will give you a fuller answer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this particular requirement been engineered?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir; the 9 individual items have been engineered by 8 separate architect engineers. The names and addresses and fees are as follows:

Improve docks, Carr & Greiner, Durham, N. C	$4,200
Visual omnidirectional range, CAA.	
Composite approach lighting, B. O. Vannort, Charlotte, N. C	3,700
Aircraft parking area, H. M. Von Ossen, Wilmington, N. C	2,060
Ammunition unloading platform and land acquisition, relocate high explosive magazines, D. M. MacKintosh, Charlotte, N. C	1,100
Flight test and emergency repair building, Lashmit, James, Brown & Pollock, Winston-Salem, N. C	2,200
Bombing targets and easements, DPWO 5ND.	
Final finish hangar, Lashmit, James, Brown & Pollock, Winston-Salem, N. C	2,300

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions upon this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. NORRELL. No questions.

Captain McKINNEY. We have only one bombing target at this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, to the tune of $190,000. Is this premised upon the same justifications that you have testified to previously?

Captain McKINNEY. That is correct.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item which is reflected as the Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif., wherein you are asking for a total of $2,492,000, made up of 9 subdivisions which are broken down monetarily into their respective cost.

I note at this installation the plant value is $43,653,349; funded construction not in plant value, $4,570,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,071,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,071,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $57,413,000.

In this instance, you will address yourself to the item of $411,000 reflected as being storage facilities, as I interpret it.

Make your presentation for that requirement, please.

Captain McKINNEY. This is to provide a one-story reinforced concrete storage building with asphalt concrete open vehicle storage area and security fencing. This is required to house equipment at this station, much of which would become seriously damaged and deteriorated if stored in the open.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Special weapons facility, $251,000.—This is required to meet the increased demand in special weapons training. It will consist of a one-story instruction building, an assembly building, guardhouse, concrete taxiway, and security fencing.

Detailed justification is contained in the classified portion of this program.

Item 2. Communication facilities, $125,000.—This is to provide for a standard remote transmitter facility for ground to air communications, which is essential for safe aircraft operation. Without this facility, reliable ground to air communications cannot be established.

Item 3. Taxiway, $170,000.—This is made necessary by the recent extension of the runway to meet jet aircraft requirements. Its provision will avoid the need of taxiing around the field and danger of taxiing on the runway.

Item 4. Storage facilities, $411,000.—

Item 5. Plano Trabuco land acquisition—(*a*) *Land, 510 acres, $69,000.*—This proposes the acquisition in fee of a target site which has been in continuous use since 1943. Acquisition is required because of prospective expiration of the lease. The high cost of decontamination by removal of unexploded projectiles (uncertain at the best) and the continuing need for the use of this target makes it urgent that this target be Government-owned. No other targets are in the vicinity of El Toro.

Item 6. Airfield pavement (Camp Pendleteon)—(*a*). *Aircraft parking apron (10 inch P. C. C.), $200,000.*—This is for urgently need pavement at MCALF Camp Pendleton for transport and helicopter parking. Aircraft are being forced to park on the taxiway and along the shoulders of the runway creating a hazardous condition.

Item 7. Aircraft parking area (second increment), $991,000.—This is for aircraft parking area in the vicinity of the new transport range. Without this pavement, the hangar facilities cannot be used to the maximum. This consists of an aircraft wash apron and required services, 1,000 linear feet of 3-cell-box culvert in irrigation drainage ditch and the installation of taxiway lights.

Item 8. Outdoor recreation facilities, $201,000.—This will provide needed outdoor recreation facilities. No community recreational facilities are near enough to be utilized regularly by station personnel.

Item 9. Compass rose for transport aircraft, $74,000.—This essential facility is required in order that the compasses of assigned aircraft can be checked and calibrated. At present, aircraft must be taken to NAS San Diego for this compass check.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice an item entitled "Airfield pavement, Camp Pendleton," for $200,000. Is this airfield pavement literally at Camp Pendleton, instead of El Toro?

Captain McKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then why is it under El Toro instead of Camp Pendleton?

Major FENTON. El Toro has management and custody control of the Astoria Field and takes care of the public works facilities of that little airstrip.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, at the El Toro operation and Camp Pendleton there is a financial difference by and between the two.

Major FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Which I presume is followed throughout your justifications for any and all expenditures, is it?

Major FENTON. Yes, sir. This is the only item you will see for that, I think, for the Marine Corps air station projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Explain the item "Plano Trabuco land acquisition," where you are asking for $69,000.

Major FENTON. That is the old target center.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much land is involved?

Captain MCKINNEY. 510 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And how much per acre?

Captain MCKINNEY. $135 an acre.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who presently owns the land?

Captain MCKINNEY. The land has been used since 1943, but the lease is expiring and we desire to acquire it in fee in order to obviate going on there and decontaminating it from the bombs that have been dropped.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we go to one of the most intricate problems that we are confronted with in California. How much and what water rights have you been buying with your land and how clearly have those water rights been defined, in order to avoid any future controversy such as we have had at Pendleton?

Captain MCKINNEY. We have no need for water at this target site. We have no people based there and it is just a short distance from the El Toro Air Station and the people travel between the target and the air station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any water facilities on the surface, or water facilities underneath the surface of the ground and the land about it?

Mr. TIENCKEN. On the surface we have a stream, the only place in that area where they have a stream. El Toro Ranch uses all of the water and grazes cattle right up to our boundaries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the procurement of the property, how much have you gone into the acquisition of the water that may be a component part of the surface that you are buying?

Captain MCKINNEY. There has been no water problem at this bombing target.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There may not be any water problem at the moment; you may not have any requirement for it at the moment, but you may be intruding on somebody's water rights in the area and walk right smack into the same kind of cockeyed thing as you did when you bought Pendleton. It seems to me now you should arrange for water rights.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The reason they have not been filed, apparently, is because there is no requirement now for water and we will not attempt to acquire water rights in that area. We will buy the surface for use as a bombing target and will not interfere with the owners of the water. This is part of a larger target and we will not disturb the water rights of any other project: we will just take those that happen to be at the surface.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are not taking over any mineral rights on this land at all and you do not contemplate any use for that purpose?

Major FENTON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Consequently, if mineral rights are included in that area, what are you going to do about it? In other words, you have a potential conflict of interest there. If you do not own the mineral rights in connection with the surface of the land and somebody becomes interested in the mineral potentialities there and you still need it for a bombing target, what is going to be the situatior?

Mr. TIENCKEN. If the minerals are oil, we will require that they take it by directional drilling, so that they do not interfere with the surface.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are telling me, I suppose, is that they could whipstock off of the side of your land; is that correct?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A good idea, if it works.

You do not feel under the present method you are procuring rights to this land that you are later going to be involved in a legal procedure due to mineral rights, of whatever character, that might pertain in this parcel of land. Is that correct, or incorrect?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And in procuring the land under the present practice, you are waiving all rights to mineral deposits therein?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many acres do you propose to buy and what is the price per acre?

Captain MCKINNEY. 510 acres, at $135 an acre. Actually we have been using this as a bombing target under lease since 1943.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has this project been engineered; is so, by whom, at what time and cost?

Captain MCHENRY. It has been engineered by a number of different engineer firms, the names, fees, and allowances of which are as follows:

Special weapons facilities, Wilson & Wilson, Los Angeles	$7,114
Communication facilities, Benedict, Beckler & Kocher, Los Angeles	2,810
Taxiway, Engineering Service Corp., Los Angeles	1,300
Storage facilities, Murray, Erick Associates, Los Angeles	3,200
Plano Trabuco land acquisition, DPWO, 11ND	No cost
Airfield pavement, Camp Pendleton, Engineering Service Corp., Los Angeles	1,000
Aircraft parking area, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, Los Angeles	4,085
Outdoor recreation facilities, Engineering Service Corp., Los Angeles	700
Compass Rose, DPWO, 11ND	No cost

MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY LANDING FIELD, EDENTON, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we will pick up the next item reflected at the top of page No. 2 "Marine Corps auxiliary landing field at Edenton, N. C.," wherein you are requesting family quarters for 5 senior staff officers, 15 junior officers and 85 enlisted, for a total figure of $1,421,500. I note at this installation the plant value is $13,500,885; funded construction not in plant value, $165,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,178,500; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,178,500; and the estimated future appropriation required, $12,293,000.

I would assume from your justification reflected at the bottom of the page, that this housing is to be constructed upon the station. Is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. That is correct. Actually this station is being used by the Marines at the present time. It is contemplated to build this into a naval auxiliary air station as soon as they can phase the Marines out.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 1. Family housing

	Number	Amount
(a) Senior officers (field grade), 1,500 square feet (average)	5	$101,250
(b) Junior officers (company grade), 1,125 square feet (average)	15	228,000
(c) Enlisted, 950 square feet (average)	85	1,092,250
Total	105	1,421,500

The 20 MOQ's and 85 MEMQ's are urgently required to alleviate the critical deficiency of family housing at this station. ALF Edenton is being built up from an ALF to a naval auxiliary air station. The nearby small town of Edenton cannot absorb the housing requirements of the assigned military personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered; if so, by whom, at what time, and the cost therefor?

Captain McHENRY. It has not been engineered. The estimate is based on criteria established by the Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Upon the same premise as those of like character heretofore reviewed; is that correct?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you look on this as a permanent station?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. What type of construction will you use for this landing field?

Captain McHENRY. I am not prepared to answer that question with finality. I would say it would be the type of construction that would be consistent with the architecture of the station and be within the established limits both of square feet and dollars.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will it be masonry or brick?

Captain McHENRY. I would assume brick masonry; yes, sir.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item reflected is that of the Marine Corps air station at Miami, Fla., for land acquisition in the amount of $1,223,000. The plant value is $20,932,271; funded construction not in plant value, $2,600,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,273,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,273,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $34,429,000.

I would like an explanation of the requirement for land acquisition; how many acres are involved and what you contemplate paying per acre.

Captain McKINNEY. I submit the following data on this project.

Item 1. Land acquisition

(*a*) Land, 640 acres	$1,183,000
(*b*) Obstruction clearance	40,000
Total	1,223,000

This is to acquire land needed to provide end zone and lateral clearance for the new 8,000-foot runway. This land is located north and west of the present station boundary and is mainly used for dairy farming. There are trees on this land and a few small houses which will have to be removed.

This is really in 3 parcels totaling 640 acres of land needed to protect the Government's interest in the airfield property and to provide aviation clearance in the field landing circle, to provide safety of life not only of the pilots, but protection to the planes themselves.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, as I interpret from your justification so far, you are buying land in the extension of the runways or at the end of the runways for protection purposes not only to the pilots but the people who may be residing or might be residing there. Is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir; and the activity is a clearance program. At the east end we are acquiring 82 acres, at the west end, 294 acres, and at the north side, 264 acres, for a total of 640 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the present habitations in that area?

Captain MCKINNEY. The 82 acres and the 194 acres by agriculture, and the 264 acres are agriculture and some residential.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the 8,000-foot new runway? Is that still under construction, or is it completed?

Captain DAWSON. It will be completed this month.

Captain MCKINNEY. This station is still being used by the Third Marine Air Wing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any properties on the land you are desirous of acquiring that would be of any value to you? I mean by that physical properties—houses, barns, and so forth?

Mr. TIENCKEN. There are 37 houses on the property varying in estimated value from $2,500 to $15,000, but they would be within the flight zone so that we have to remove them. They could be valuable after they are moved, but not in their present location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume they are constructed in such a manner that they are movable?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We have not made an investigation of that. Generally speaking, in purchases of this sort, if the owner desires to take the house we permit him to remove his house at a reduction in purchase price.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered; if so, by whom, at what time and the cost thereof?

Captain MCHENRY. It has not been engineered. This is just land acquisition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Preliminary appraisals have been made?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There have been no options taken on the property, I assume?

Mr. TIENCKEN. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So the appraisals are subject to change and I assume if the purchases become difficult enough you might possibly have to go to condemnation proceedings; is that correct?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the proposed use for this land?

Admiral CLARK. No use.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is just land to be owned on which you have an 8,000-foot runway?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. You do not plan any new building on that land?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir; they plan to remove the buildings that are on there if they are obstructions, or to the extent they are.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the purpose of this land?

Captain MCKINNEY. To provide air clearance in that area and prevent the erection of any other building that would interfere with the landing operations.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you need all of the 640 acres?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. That is necessary in the clearance program. The Miami area is building up and it is to prevent encroachment around the airfield area and to protect the Government's interest in the investment.

Admiral CLARK. We will probably lease this land out for farming subject to restrictions. We usually lease out portions of land of this nature for agricultural purposes, as long as the operations do not interfere with the planes landing. In other words, it is perfectly acceptable for people to engage in grazing.

Mr. HANABURY. This photograph will illustrate to you what we are trying to do here [exhibiting]:

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you feel that will prevent future difficulties because of established flight patterns or anything of that similar character. Is that correct?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And also obviates people moving up against it.

Admiral RUSSELL. We take our airfields out into a detached area and once they are installed the town grows in that area. Miramar was out by itself on a mesa. Immediately the airfield goes in, there are hotdog stands and everything else. The town grows in that direction and the first thing we know we have a great mass of complaints against our operations.

These acquisitions, as in this case, are designed to protect our investment and make our facility usable in the future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Don't you think, in a procedure of that character, because it is a universal experience, it is nothing that is an innovation here, that when you went out for your original requirement for the extension of the runway you should have secured the land at that time?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is correct, sir. This is hindsight now, of course. We found in World War II we acquired fields rapidly and didn't consider all that.

It is now necessary to protect them.

Mr. ANDREWS. I don't see how a person would have much right to complain about noise. If he buys a piece of land on the side of your land he knows full well that you have a runway there and you will use it for a field. When he buys that land, he runs a risk of being bothered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that is true, but if the person is close to reciprocal operation, that is another thing, however. You have that

wherever you go. It has been universal. People will encroach. There is no question about it.

They move into the area, set up some kind of a little enterprise, and the next thing you know the jets take off and they begin to complain.

Complaints are that chickens quit laying eggs, cows give sour milk, and things such as that. But the complaints become difficult.

Furthermore, you always have this aspect of it as well: The pilot may come in sometimes, something may happen, and he cracks up right on top of one of those activities.

We had that happen in California not long ago and in Arizona where a series of houses were torn up. While the people didn't complain about the noise there was plenty of trouble because of the damage to the houses; in one instance there was the loss of four lives, aside from the burning up of the plane, the pilot, and 2 or 3 people aboard being killed.

You have a continuity of those hazards, and I personally believe you will have to devote considerable attention to the extension of runways, particularly where population already is established.

I have more sympathy for those who have been there than those who move into the area, to be frank with you, but it nevertheless creates a difficult legal situation, and it has been very costly.

We have had many, many claims settled, as I understand it, over a period of time, because of accidents caused near an operational field.

Further questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY AIR STATION, MOJAVE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station at Mojave, Calif. This is comprised of three subrequirements—Tactical vehicle maintenance facility, land acquisition, family housing. $2,177,400 is the amount of request.

I note at this installation the plant value is $9,094,676; funded construction not in plant value, $237,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,510,400; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,510,400; and the estimated future appropriation required, $55,918,000.

Will you make your presentation for this requirement?

Captain MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, item 1, Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility, is for a closed maintenance shop to serve the 584 trucks, jeeps and other tactical vehicles assigned to the Marine Air Group. The facility will have outside cleaning, greasing and steam racks, with an adequate parking area, all enclosed in a chain link fence.

The second item is for land acquisition of 420 acres. This project provides for the purchase of 420 acres of land belonging to the Kern County, which lies within the station boundaries. The 420 acres comprise the former Kern County Airport. The total land area of the station is 2,506 acres, of which 420 acres is a part.

The land now is being used without ownership or lease since 1952, when the lease expired under the limitations of the lease provisions.

The Civil Aeronautics——

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have been operating by common consent, then. Is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. There are some differences of opinion as to the purchase price. The Civil Aeronautics Authority expended $156,140 for runway and lighting at this station which Kern County thinks they should be reimbursed for.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That was a Federal appropriation, was it not?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Kern County now is trying to coast in on the Federal appropriation?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. We are asking only for $25,000 which is fair value for this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the Civil Aeronautics Authority ever completely dedicated their investment to Kern County other than that of an operational facility, that is through what we call use procedure?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, the Civil Aeronautics contributes the fund direct to the county and the county then uses it and it becomes their airport.

These things, of course, were partly as the result of military requests as some of these airports are developed. This particular one was developed back in World War II, and it was expanded by the military so that the four hundred-some odd acres is the center portion of it, and the military runways are a continuation of these.

The $25,000 represents the amount of money that Kern County put into the original development. It does not include any of the Federal grant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of your population at the end of this runway?

In other words, by acquiring the 420 acres you will obviate all hazards involved?

Mr. HANABURY. This forms part of the present airfield. Our runway is constructed on this property. This is an integral part of the existing airfield.

Mr. TIENCKEN. This is the center. We go completely around it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are doing here in the development request, so far as these funds are concerned, is obviating later difficulty because you already own the land and there will be no encroachment. You will not have to go out in the future and buy land for protection purposes, operational and otherwise. Is that correct?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HANABURY. I am not saying there will not be future land requests. This is to clear up the future foreseeable problems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you anticipate the future will involve?

Mr. HANABURY. From personal knowledge of the site, having gone over it, I think we may have future land acquisitions at Mojave.

Mr. TIENCKEN. In the avigation easement program the $23 million program is $205,000 for additional land acquisition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen.

Captain, has this been engineered?

Captain McHENRY. The first item was engineered at Government expense within the past 6 months. The second item has been appraised by conflicting interests.

Captain McKINNEY. We have 162 family quarters at this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That has been engineered according to the technique of those in the past, Captain?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir.

MARINE AIR CORPS FACILITY, NEW RIVER, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next is the Marine Corps air facility at New River, N. C. This is composed of 13 subsidiary requirements. Is that correct?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

I note at this installation the plant value is $1,206,000; funded construction not in plant value, $7,624,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,762,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,762,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $9,385,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Wherein the total is reflected as being $2,762,000.

Captain McKINNEY. That is correct.

(The following was submitted later:)

Airfield pavements (second increment), $831,000.—This is to provide required aircraft parking pavement, the second increment to the group helicopter landing and takeoff area. It is needed for parking for the VMO squadron, parking for transport aircraft at the station operations building, and access pavement for the class C hangar.

Item 2. Dispensary, $207,000.—This is for the construction of a permanent 1-story 2-bed dispensary of 6,000 square feet. It will house the sick-call room, record office, aviation examining room, and dental clinic. The existing facilities are far below the required standards.

Item 3. Public works administration and shop building, $143,000.—This is to provide a permanent public works facility which will include office and shop space. The present area occuped by the Public Works Department is inadequate and the facilities available are insufficient to meet the workload.

Item 4. Supply warehouse, $169,000.—Existing temporary space is less than one-eighth of the requirement. This necessitates frequent replenishment from MCAS Cherry Point, a haul of over 55 miles.

Item 5. Paved areas for vehicle parking and open storage, $58,000.—This is to furnish necessary parking areas and access paving for the Navy supply warehouse, public works administration and shop building, and the dispensary of asphalt concrete surface with shell rock base. The type of soil and the weather in this area complicate maintenance of vehicles parked in the open.

Item 6. Enlisted men's recreation building, $180,000.—This will furnish facilities for snack bar, gameroom (pool, billards, and table tennis), reading room, and a small office and storage space. There are no such facilities on the station and the nearest town is 5 miles away.

Item 7. Fire and crash truck station, $93,000.—This is for a 3-stall fire and crash truck facility, including personnel housing. Equipment and operators are on 24-hour call and must be on the line at all takeoffs and landings for rescue and fire prevention. The new fire and crash trucks are presently parked out of doors.

Item 8. Gymnasium, $224,000.—This is for a standard gymnasium, four bowling alley lanes, special services office and gear locker, essential for morale and physical fitness of personnel. There are no indoor recreation facilities at this remote air station.

Item 9. Chapel, $202,000.—This is for a 1-story chapel of 300 seats and Sunday school area. A chapel on the base is necessary to afford personnel an opportunity to practice their religious faith and still comply with the exigencies of the military service and country.

Item 10. Outdoor recreation facilities, $98,000.—A centrally located, properly constructed outdoor recreation area, easily accessible to the living area of the personnel based on this installation, is a necessary requirement for the Marine Corps physical fitness and for offduty recreation programs.

Item 11. Theater, $150,000.—This is for a 500-seat theater with stage. It will provide wholesome offduty recreation for all station personnel and their dependents. This is especially important at an isolated station where no similar commercial facilities are available.

Item 12. Combat training tank, $134,000.—This is to provide an outdoor 25-meter training pool and bathhouse. Proper physical fitness at all times is a requirement of all marines. This pool will also be used for survival training for pilots and aircrews.

Item 13. Utilities:

(*a*) Steam distribution	$207,770
(*b*) Paving	48,000
(*c*) Electrical distribution	10,900
(*d*) Drainage	6,330
Total	273,000

This is to provide utilities to the new structures in this program. It will include steam distribution lines, access paving, electric distribution lines, and drainage for fiscal year 1956 construction projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You start off with $831,000 for airfield pavements. Are these requirements upon the same premise of those heretofore reviewed by the committee, gentlemen?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is the second increment, and the increment is broken down into five projects. One is a helicopter landing and parking area for the Marine observation squadron. An additional parking area for fixed wing aircraft, air facility operations room to park 10 large transport planes. Parking area for helicopters and associated aircraft of Marine air group.

Last is extension of the hangar aprons.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting a gymnasium at a cost of $224,000. What is the necessity for that request?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is a standard gymnasium, Mr. Chairman. It meets the Department of Defense criteria for this size of station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have anything of like character on the station at the present time and, if so, what type?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. There is no existing facility at the station at this time. The nearest gym is 20 miles away, which is at Camp Lejeune.

This station was established in April of 1944, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What particular activities are you bringing into being which require the facilities enumerated in the justifications?

Captain MCKINNEY. This station provides facility to support regular operations of the Fleet Marine Force helicopter transport and observation aircraft in direct support of ground forces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this as integral a part of your expansion program as the rest of your presentations have been?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, have these requirements been engineered, and, if so, by whom, what time, and what is the cost thereof?

Captain MCHENRY. The first 5 items engineered by J. N. Pease & Co., Charlotte, N. C., for a total cost of $6,975.

The other items were engineered by Lowenstein-Atkinson Associates of Greensboro, N. C., within the past 6 months, for a total cost of $9,460.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this one of those universal chapels shown here on this page?

Captain MCKINNEY. A 1-story chapel with a 300-seat capacity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is multidenominational?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish you would explain this for me: I notice in connection with all these buildings, for instance the gymnasium, item 8, you have $187,907 for the building and $19,217 for services, and collateral, $16,816.

What are those items?

Captain MCHENRY. Furniture, file cabinets, desks, athletic equipment, and items of that nature. Services are utilities—water, light, walks, landscaping, et cetera.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

Captain MCKINNEY. Things to make a building a habitable operating facility.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, JOHN H. TOWERS FIELD, ANNAPOLIS

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item we will refer to is the Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis area, Maryland.

This is made up of 26 supporting items, with total cost of $16,900,000.

Is that the total estimated cost to complete all of this particular field and the subsidiary requirements, to wit, the 26 items to which I have referred?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is a new facility. I will ask Admiral Russell to explain it.

Admiral RUSSELL. $16,900,000, Mr. Chairman, is for the air station per se. In future years if we move, as we must some day move away from Anacostia and move to this field, there certainly will be additional funds required to cover this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are addressing yourself to now is an expansion over and above the $16 million as delineated in your justifications here now?

Admiral RUSSELL. There will be future requests, I am sure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am addressing my question to, first, is this particular project authorized by law at this time?

Admiral CLARK. It is authorized by the House bill. The Senate bill has not yet been acted on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is being considered by the Senate committee, I presume?

Admiral CLARK. The Senate committee has not considered this project, Mr. Chairman. What happened was this: The Air Force started out before the House Armed Services Committee at the same time the Navy started out with the Senate. But the House moved faster, and the Navy actually, after the Senate hearings were completed, the Navy got through the House hearings and the House made their report, and at that time the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Vinson, introduced this item.

The Senate already had completed their hearings for the Navy items, and the House report came out with this in it and the Senate report, having been based on hearings before this introduction, did not contain this item.

It will be either included or not included, depending on the conference between the House and Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the Navy appeared before the Armed Services Committee of the House, did the Navy testify this requirement or any part thereof?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; they did.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you do it under interrogation or was it part of the prepared testimony?

Admiral CLARK. In our original presentation this item was not included because the planning in the Navy Department had gone to a point where approximately 1 month before the hearings started it was decided that perhaps we had not gone far enough in our planning to include it in this year's program, and it was therefore deferred with the idea of introducing it next year.

However, the report of the Board of Visitors came out very strongly recommending that it be no longer delayed because of the fast approaching day when the training planes now in use at Annapolis would no longer be usable. They are old seaplanes, we do not intend to make more of them, and the committee felt we should start now bringing it to the attention of Congress, even though we had not a firm site selected.

Mr. Vinson concurred with the report of the Board of Visitors and introduced this this year.

We therefore had preliminary figures because of our long-range planning which we had done before Mr. Vinson put in the project.

This has not been minutely planned and these are mostly estimates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you tell us at this time who are the present Board of Visitors?

Admiral CLARK. I can tell you some. I will supply the complete list to the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will do that, please.

(The information requested has been furnished to the committee.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, what engineering, if any, has been done with relation to this site by your Department, by contractors, or by any other procedure ordinarily followed by your Department?

Captain MCHENRY. Prior to the presentation of the appropriation bill we had feasibility studies prepared on this site by Thomas Bourne & Associates, of Washington, D. C., at a cost of $5,890. The estimate is based on similar construction prices we have paid in this area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For example, if a site has not been determined as yet, is it to be assumed by the members of this committee that your cost of runways and taxiways to the extent they are reflected in the items here, $5,216,000, could and would be accurate?

Captain MCHENRY. May I answer that off the record, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, a feasibility estimate was made by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and his own air operational officers, in which they looked around at surrounding country in an endeavor to see if there were any sites within 20 minutes to a half-hour bus ride from the Naval Academy where an airfield could be built which would not interfere with other air traffic in the area, and where from a driving-overlook, or a study of topographical maps, it would make it appear that it was feasible to put an airfield.

They came up with a study in which they drew some circles on maps and said "here are some possibilities."

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many fields of feasibility conclusions were in the so-called circled category, 3 or 4?

Admiral CLARK. Three, sir.

Of those three the Navy Department has not decided whether any one of them is feasible, and we come to the point where, before we could select a site and should select a site, we feel that if we can get the authority of the Congress, if they approve of the idea, then we can go out and make on-site feasibility studies, borings, and pinpoint one of these sites.

From what we know today we think any one of the three would be feasible. We think one is more feasible than the others, but it has not been approved by the Navy Department.

Should this become authorized and should it be approved for funding, we intend to spend only $4 million the first year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask you this question——

Admiral CLARK. In other words, it is our present intention to fund only the A. and E. study, architectural and engineering study, and if it shows a solid feasibility then we will commend land acquisition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then am I to understand——

Admiral CLARK. All these other items, sir, we are asking for authority and approval for funding, but we do not intend to spend more than $4 million on this project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask you this if I may, Captain: What has your background experience indicated it would cost to have an adequate survey made of sites in order that you could determine the site upon which you wanted to center?

Captain MCHENRY. Selection of the site would be basically a military consideration. The general land areas in this vicinity, with few exceptions, are all very acceptable construction sites. Unless you get down along the water edge and a marshy area along Chesapeake Bay you would have an acceptable construction site in almost every one of the areas to serving the operational requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I may be in error in my retentive ability, but it occurs to me that out of the 3 sites there was 1 and possibly 2 of them which were associated with marshy land conclusions.

Captain MCHENRY. On that basis either or both of those would be considerably more expensive than the other, and would be selected only because of operational peculiarity which just could not be abandoned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long would it normally take you to survey a site of this character which was determined upon and come up with some firm figures as to costs of the 26 satellite requirements reflected in your justifications?

Captain MCHENRY. Within 90 days we could have an excellent advance planning report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would you consider to be enough funds to cover advanced planning?

Captain MCHENRY. Somewhere between one-half and 1 percent of the total value of the project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Reduce that to figures, please.

Captain MCHENRY. Between $80,000 and $150,000, depending on negotiations with the A. and E.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you consider you would be spending the balance of the $4 million for over and above the A. and E. costs which the captain has referred to, and we will set the figure arbitrarily at the $150,000?

Captain MCHENRY. That is only the advanced planning, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that.

Next step would be acquisition of the land.

Admiral CLARK. A. and E. would be next. He talked first of the feasibility study, is that right?

Captain MCHENRY. Advance planning. Following that we would have to have definitive plans and specifications for construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But you would not obviously go ahead with that until such time as you had your land definitely buttoned up, would you?

Captain MCHENRY. That is correct, but immediately as the land was buttoned up we would proceed so as to save time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am getting at is the sequence which normally would be followed here.

One would be your temporary survey of costs and then your determination of a site which was concluded as the one the military wanted, and then you go into your completed planning?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Planning for the entire installations on the project as reflected here?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There might be some shifting or changing in the presentation here due to the site selected. Would that be logical?

For example, you have drainage in one instance, lighting, and various and sundry other things which would be determinable upon the proximity in the utilities field by those established. One field might be closer to them than another, drainage in one instance might be more expensive or extensive than in others, which leaves those categories in a hypothetical state so far as your appropriation requirement is concerned. Is that right?

Captain MCHENRY. That is correct. The individual items may vary up and down.The general total would stay pretty much where it is, we think.

However, we are shooting in the dark until we have a specific site selected.

Admiral CLARK. We estimated that if we approved the site which at first blush appeared most feasible that the land acquisition would amount to about $3,200,000 and that the architectural and engineering definitive plan would cost about $800,000. That is why I said, Mr. Chairman, we estimate that we would spend $4 million this year. We would do the advanced planning Captain McHenry spoke of by using the advanced planning fund which we have for all our projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of the 3 locations involved, what is the Annapolis center of operations to these 3 points, starting with the closest one, then the second, and then the third. In your response it might be advisable not to name the sites on the record. Just give me the mileage without reference to any particular geographical area.

Admiral CLARK. As the crow flies, sir, they are all between 10 and 12 miles from the city of Annapolis.

By road they would all be between 15 minutes to a half hour by bus. The idea of this is so that the midshipmen can be taken down during the long drill periods and get a worthwhile amount of work done during the indoctrination phases of this. There will be some times when they will go down and stay a whole morning and perhaps when the curriculum is revised, and I am sure it will be, they may spend a week or two there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the planning requirement necessity as at present determined by those who make policy within the Navy?

Admiral CLARK. The main change in our requirement in this respect, Mr. Chairman, is to introduce the midshipman to the operation of modern jet aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean in his primary status, or what?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if you follow through with this program at Annapolis, those cadets would not have to be exposed later to primary training as you are presently functioning?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; they would be. This is for the indoctrination and instruction of every graduate in the capabilities and limitations of jet modern aircraft, where they fit into the naval officers' day to day work, whether he be a flier or not. Fliers would go through the preliminary course at Pensacola, but they would have the background behind them, what you call the A B C's of the capabilities and limitations of modern aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course you would only take those cadets who are going into the flying branch of the service?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; we would take everyone. We feel it is important that every officer, whether or not he be an aviator, or whether he be a line officer or not, he should know enough about the capabilities and limitations of modern aircraft so that if he becomes a supply officer at a big naval air station there will be many, many times when he will be able to perform his duties better if he knows what a jet aircraft is all about, what support is required for that aircraft, and the whole business and not just the mechanics of flying the plane.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What additional time will this added curricula require of your cadets as compared to the present training?

I ask that because the testimony heretofore has been, as I recall it, that we are exacting just about as much out of our cadets as we can in the present time limitations. If that be true then you are adding extra curricula there, are you not, which would mean you will have to extend the time which the cadets attend?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. Mr. Chairman. What you say is very true. It has been noted by every Board of Visitors for the last 10 years that although it is desirable and sometimes highly desirable to take more subjects, the midshipmen's time is crowded.

So, to begin with, we would use this field, whether or not we did anything to the curriculum, we already give them a good deal of basic training right at North Severn, across from the Naval Academy proper. I believe that will be extended.

Whether or not they will do it in the academic year, by deferring some other part of their undergraduate instruction, or whether they will devote more time in the summer to going to and from this air station, living at the Naval Academy and utilizing it then, I don't know.

In fact I know that at the present moment Admiral Boone is reexamining the curricula to see where this best can be worked in.

But even if he doesn't give it more time than they do today, we believe this is an absolute must because we are faced with not having any planes within 3 years where we can give midshipmen instruction.

We are not building primary trainers on floats any more, no more seaplanes in the primary training.

It seems much better to give them the same types of trainers and also let them see the operations of operational rather than training type planes at the Naval Academy airfield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming that a student is at Annapolis this year, where do you take him now for these flying operations? What do you do with the student now to indoctrinate him in flying operations?

Admiral CLARK. They don't get as much as they should. They have what they call an aviation summer. They take them on indoctrination tours, take them to airfields. I believe Admiral Russell can describe it perhaps more fully than I can.

Admiral RUSSELL. The indoctrination of the midshipmen currently is on the old N–3's on floats in the Severn River, sir. There is a seaplane stationed there with controls, a tower, and flights performed from the water.

Occasionally they bring in large flying boats, and in addition to the instruction there in aviation one of the summers is devoted largely to aviation training, also. This would replace the seaplane facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This would replace the antiquated type of ship you have there now, modernize it, and bring it into the jet category. Is that correct?

Admiral RUSSELL. We would have all varieties of planes at this field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are doing is putting on another primary training field, are you not?

Admiral RUSSELL. It is indoctrination. We would like to show how the jet operates, how the regular carrier type propellered plane operates, antisubmarine warfare, and we can conduct classes in any of these things if we have the field.

This is now lacking at the Naval Academy although in the past I think we had authority for the field but could not arrange for the actual consummation of it because funds were not appropriated. There was some difficulty in the past.

But about 50 percent of the Navy is involved in aviation, and the midshipmen should have aviation training along with their ordinary training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I agree with that but I wonder what has been happening to them heretofore. We have turned out some fine pilots in the Navy through some process. How have you done it in the past?

Admiral RUSSELL. This indoctrination has been done by float planes and flying boats in the river, what has been done at the Naval Academy. Otherwise they must go to an entirely different place for this training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. As I understand it, you have no flight training facilities for the midshipmen?

Admiral RUSSELL. Not flight training to make pilots of them. They have flight training. They fly, shoot machineguns, and actually get the feel of the controls. They do not come out as pilots, however. This is indoctrination training.

Mr. ANDREWS. What would this add to a man's training which Pensacola doesn't give them?

Admiral RUSSELL. Pensacola just makes a pilot, sir. This is aimed at making a naval officer acquainted with aviation for his professional good. They are two different problems.

Do I make myself clear, sir?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think so. You can take a midshipman and have him fly jet aircraft which you cannot do today?

Admiral RUSSELL. Unless you take him to a jet field. It involves the expense of carrying the students there, bringing them back, quartering them there, and so on.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

One other point. Did I understand you to say that this Senate Armed Services Committee had hearings on this project?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; the Senate did not. The Senate had finished their hearings before the House started its hearings.

The House started their hearings. Mr. Vinson introduced this, which is strongly supported by the Navy. They put out their report before the Senate put out their report because they were still considering—the Senate finished the regular hearings but they were reconsidering—some projects after the hearings were over.

Mr. ANDREWS. I get the point now.

Admiral CLARK. That delayed their report.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, after the Senate had been conversant with the fact that the House committee had placed this project in the bill, the Senate had not as yet changed its opinion about it so far as you know. Is that right?

Admiral CLARK. I cannot answer that, Mr. Chairman. I didn't discuss it with the Senators.

May I go off the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be appropriate at this time to insert this statement in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, RELATIVE TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR AIRFIELD FACILITIES FOR THE TRAINING AND INDOCTRINATION OF MIDSHIPMEN, UNITED STATES NAVY

As Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, it is my responsibility to deliver to the fleet each year a group of graduates who are fully prepared and qualified to perform the duties and discharge the responsibilities of junior officers, and who possess a sound educational and indoctrinational foundation for future professional development. Having regard for the technological development and changes in naval welfare over the last four decades, it is as necessary for today's naval officer, whether pilot or not, to be familiar with the basic characteristics, capabilities, limitations, operational techniques, and tactics of naval aircraft as it is for him to possess a fundamental knowledge of ships. He must have an ingrained and abiding air-consciousness and airmindedness.

Reflecting the trend in the development of our modern Navy and Marine Corps, approximately 50 percent, I am told, of the total resources, in terms of

men and money, available to our naval establishment is now being allocated to activities directly associated with naval and Marine Corps aviation. In my opinion, the educational curriculum and indoctrinational program at the Naval Academy have not kept pace with this transition in our fleet. It is my considered judgment that the aviation segment of the course at the Naval Academy requires substantial strengthening, if this institution is to continue to fulfill its assigned mission.

Since the Navy's first air facility was activated at the Naval Academy in 1911, an adequate air station for the Naval Academy has been a growing requirement. Parenthetically, West Point has an air station and, of course, the new Air Force Academy will have one. The requirement for a Naval Academy airfield has been officially recognized for the past 12 years yet, for one reason or another, the Naval Academy still does not have adquate facilities for the education and indoctrination of future officers in the field of modern naval aviation. In this air age, when naval aviation is the very spearhead of our modern naval striking and antisubmarine forces, and when the future role of naval aviation in our country's defense looms more vital and demanding than ever before, this situation has become wholly untenable in principle. As stated by the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy in 1947, and echoed in substance by competent authorities many times since, "At this time it would seem as inappropriate for the Naval Academy to be without an airfield of the highest military type, as for it to be without a harbor and major waterways adjacent thereto." While the report to the President by this year's Board of Visitors has not yet been released for publication, I believe that it would not be out of order for me to inform this committee that, taking all factors into consideration, this year's Board considered it vitally necessary that construction of a Naval Academy airfield proceed at the earliest practicable date. It is noteworthy that the Congress, in 1948, approved this project in principle by authorizing funds in the amount of $12 million for the construction of an airfield at the Naval Academy. Funds were never appropriated, however, and this authorization is no longer in effect.

At the present time we have a small seaplane facility on the Severn River opposite the Naval Academy proper. All indoctrinational pilot training of midshipmen is carried on in N3N-type seaplanes. This is an obsolete single-float biplane trainer which has been in service since 1934. There are a total of 48 of this type remaining in existence, of which we shall actively operate 40 this summer and next fall. Some feel that indoctrinating midshipmen in this obsolete type is worse than no indoctrination at all but I don't agree. Beginning this coming August, these N3N's will reach the end of their normal service life, and the last is scheduled to go out of service in November 1957. By that time, it is probable that the number available will be reduced below our operational needs, by virtue of normal attrition. Major spares are already becoming scarce. The Navy does not contemplate procuring a replacement seaplane since to do so for this one purpose would not be economical. Furthermore, we do not favor replacement with a new seaplane trainer type since our seaplane training operations are seriously hampered whenever we have winds over 18 knots or temperatures below 28° F. The schedule of midshipmen is so jampacked that time lost cannot be made up.

In the light of these factors, it is evident that unless new provisions are started now, there will be an interruption of indoctrinational flight training at the Naval Academy. Studies have indicated that it would be uneconomical and unsatisfactory to conduct such training elsewhere. It is my firm conviction, gentlemen, that provision of a modern air activity as an integral and intimate part of a midshipman's life at the Naval Academy where midshipmen can study modern fleet aircraft in operation, is a major and urgent requirement to enable us to continue to attract young men of the desired caliber, and in sufficient numbers, to meet the future needs of the Navy.

Through a preliminary engineering survey, we have selected what we consider to be a satisfactory site for the establishment of an airfield to meet the needs of the Naval Academy.

In this connection, it is important to realize that the countryside in the general vicinity of the Naval Academy is undergoing rapid development, and as a result the difficulties attendant upon the acquisition of a suitable airfield site, and the prospective price, are increasing on an ascending scale. These appear to be added reasons for procurement of the land for an airfield at the earliest possible date, if an airfield is ever to be provided at all.

The Chief of Naval Operations is aware of the urgent need for an airfield at the Naval Academy. Incident to my formal recommendation in the premises, the

possibility of including such an item in the Navy's request for public works under the fiscal 1956 budget was considered in the Navy Department in February, but the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations felt at that time that the studies of the project had not progressed sufficiently for it to be included in the Navy requests for fiscal 1956. I now understand through discussion with Navy Department officials that these studies have now progressed to the point that the Department is ready to proceed with the project now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this facility been cleared by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, if you know?

Admiral CLARK. I believe it has not, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same question applies to the Bureau of the Budget.

Admiral CLARK. I believe not, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions on the item involved here, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NORRELL. No questions.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION AT CHINCOTEAGUE, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected on the next page, "Naval auxiliary air station at Chincoteague, Va." It is comprised of aircraft maintenance hangar and parking apron, an infirmary, and a special projects building, total of $2,858,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $16,143,556; funded construction not in plant value, $3,980,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,628,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,628,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $26,086,000.

Will you make your presentation as to the requirements, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. This aircraft maintenance hangar, including parking apron, is needed immediately to provide maintenance for fleet squadrons now operating from tents and portable nose hangars at this station.

The two permanent hangars at this station are being fully utilized at this time. One is being used in a classified ordnance development and test work, and the other by the utility squadron corps and an air development squadron, too.

(The following was submitted later:)

Item 2. Infirmary (20 beds), $561,000.—The present infirmary is structurally unsafe, is not watertight, and constitutes an extreme fire hazard to bed patients, expecting mothers and newborn babies. The present infirmary was designed for 1,500 military, 80 civilians, and no dependents. With the increased population of 2,044 military, 725 civilians, and 1,500 military dependents the existing medical facilities cannot meet the station needs.

Item 3. Special projects building, parking area, access road, and taxiway, $500,000.—This is required to provide the essential shore support facilities for the Atlantic Fleet guided missile program. This provides the essential office, shop, utility, and trianing facilities required to augment existing station facilities to permit accomplishment of the assigned mission. Detailed justification is contained in the classified portion of this program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you notice in the justification that you state, "No water is available for fire protection"?

This is a property which has been in existence for how long? Is it since 1954?

Captain MCKINNEY. Established 1943, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been our total capital investment in that plant for 1943?

Captain MCKINNEY. $16,143,556.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You presently have $3,980,000 under construction there?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. That may be completed, Mr. Chairman, but it may not have been taken up on the plant account.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does it come about that we have no water available for fire protection there with this kind of investment?

Admiral RUSSELL. Just this immediate area, because it is off to the side, does not have the water mains. They are using stands with tests. The statement that there is no fire protection means there is no immediate fire protection—water not piped to this particular area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you do have fire protection to take care of the capital investment?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This being an addition thereto does not have it and that is what the sentence I just referred to means; is that correct?

Admiral RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, how much engineering has been applied to this area, if any, and, if any, what kind and at how much cost?

Captain MCHENRY. All three items have been advance planned by Clark, Buhr & Nexsen of Norfolk, Va., within the past 6 months at a cost of $12,038.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION, INYOKERN, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval ordnance test station at Inyokern (China Lake), Calif."

You want $2,615,000. I note at this installation the plant value is $162,245,692; funded construction not in plant value, $10,151,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,615,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,615,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,615,000.

Will you make your presentation to that requirement, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. This structure is required to house and operate the new armament systems facility now being developed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How far is this from Inyokern?

Admiral RUSSELL. It is in Inyokern. The Navy actually changed the name to China Lake to avoid ambiguity in the post office system. Inyokern is a small town about 12 or 15 miles away, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is all one unit and should be considered as such?

Admiral CLARK. We are in China Lake now, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You use that purely as a name. It does not influence the operation and the proximity of the function?

Admiral CLARK. You are right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Admiral RUSSELL. Nothing has been changed except we have been asked to use the name "China Lake" to avoid ambiguity in the postal system, sir. Facilities are exactly the same.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What can you give us as presently going on in the China Lake area which requires the expenditure of this $2 million-plus?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is armament evaluation system. The combat effectiveness of our present Naval airplanes are dependent upon making effective hits on enemy aircraft before the enemy can get in and make their hits.

Fighter and interceptor aircraft have been penalized beyond their operational capabilities for the lack of satisfactory fire-control systems.

This project has been under study for the past 7 years and because of the lack of this facility there have been 2 to 4 years delay in several of the proposed aircraft armament fire-control systems.

This project has been approved by the Navy Research Council.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does this have to do with triangulation?

Admiral RUSSELL. No, sir.

Captain MCKINNEY. This facility will be available to all service and civilian contractors involved in the manufacture of armament systems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The major portion of the operation involved here is part of a very delicate function; is it not?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. Captain McKinney, what are the engineering features of this project?

Captain MCKINNEY. Advance planning was done by Pierce Management, Inc., and von Storck, Evans, Scandale & Burkavage, Scranton, Pa., for $31,400.

NAVAL AIR STATION, LAKEHURST, N. J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J. This is composed of four subsidiary requirements—catapult and arresting gear development facilities, airship envelope storage, air navigation aids, and HTA hangar and operations facilities; $16,311,000 is the total request.

I note at this installation the plant value is $29,055,783; funded construction not in plant value, $2,961,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $16,311,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $16,311,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $21,528,000.

I would like you to go through these very definitively at this time if you will, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. Item 1 is the catapult and arresting gear development facilities, for which we are requesting $14,735,000.

The present facilities are located at the Naval Air Materiel Center at Philadelphia. However, these are obsolete since the field there is incapable of expansion to handle the jet planes.

The present catapult-development facilities is required at Lakehurst. It must be developed to catapult heavy planes. It requires heavier equipment and machinery.

The longer runways are necessary, because when the plane does not catch when it makes its original landing it should have sufficient

runway space for it to come to rest before it reaches the end of the line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of this total request of $16 million-plus is to be allocated to the so-called blimp function at Lakehurst as compared to other types?

Captain MCKINNEY. Actually the item 2 is for an envelope storage facility, sir.

Item 3 is for air-navigation aids. Those two items are for airships.

Item 4 is for heavier than air hangars, which is for the heavier than air aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you mean by collateral equipment?

Captain MCKINNEY. I haven't found it.

Admiral CLARK. Under item 2.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Subitem 7 is reflected as being collateral equipment, for which you want $19,000.

Captain MCHENRY. I have a note on that, sir. Maintenance equipment for use in connection with repairing and overhauling of these airship envelopes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the length of the runways at Philadelphia?

Captain MCKINNEY. It is impossible to extend the runways at Philadelphia, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you state they are obsolete. I interpret from your justifications that you are practically moving the entire operation from the Naval Air Material installation at Philadelphia to Lakehurst?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is right.

Captain MCHENRY. One end abuts the Naval shipyard and the other end abuts the Delaware River.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The only thing you can do there is to widen them out.

Captain MCHENRY. That would not do it, sir.

Admiral RUSSELL. Longest runway is 5,200 feet, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. A 5,000-foot runway is obsolete today, is it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. For some ships.

Captain MCKINNEY. It is for jet aircraft.

Mr. ANDREWS. You are going into jets?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir. Longer runways are needed for the catapult controls and arresting gear. The jets come in, and if they are not stopped by the arresting gear they have to have sufficient runway to come to a dead stop.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it reasonable to assume, gentlemen, I do not find land acquisition here at Lakehurst, that you must obviously have all the land you need there, not wholly for the purpose of your operational requirements but also to avoid any population interjection which might take place at a later date?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

The reservation is adequate, existing reservation is adequate to accommodate this facility.

This is Government-owned land up here, Fort Dix.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total of the Government-owned land within the confines of the fencing you have at Lakehurst?

Admiral RUSSELL. About 7,500 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is all within fences?

Admiral RUSSELL. 7,357.9 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do the deep blue marks indicate?

Admiral RUSSELL. Expeditionary catapult and arresting operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I refer to the unequal alinements reflected there.

Admiral RUSSELL. Low land, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that marshy land?

Admiral RUSSELL. Slightly marshy, with some small streams.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where do you expect to do the expansion work on that chart?

Admiral RUSSELL. At these points shown here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much filling are you going to have to do to go ahead with the runways, both in your expansion operations and otherwise?

Admiral RUSSELL. Cuts and fills will balance out. There will be no importation of material. There is plenty of sand and gravel within the area.

I would say the slope of the land in this entire area doesn't vary more than 10 or 15 feet.

Captain MCHENRY. Not that much.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered, Captain?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If so by whom, the time, and cost?

Captain MCHENRY. Catapults and powerplant have been engineered by the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Runway and taxiway are advance planned by Louis Berger, of East Orange, N. J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How old is the station at Lakehurst?

Admiral RUSSELL. Established in 1921, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is our present capital investment on that base?

Captain MCKINNEY. $29,055,783.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No, sir.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is:

Item 2. Airship envelope storage, $383,000.—To meet present procurement and overhaul schedules, additional storage space must be provided for approximately 54 airship envelopes over and above existing storage facilities. Lakehurst is the only air station where airships can be overhauled or commissioned and sufficient envelope storage space must be provided if requirements are to be met.

Item 3. Air navigation aids, $139,000.—This is required for standard instrument approach procedures. When the new airfield was completed it rendered the radio range station and the 2 Macher (radio homing device) useless in that it could not guide pilots to the new airfields 3 miles from the old field. It is necessary to move the existing radio range towers, antennas, and homing device to a location which will be alined with the instrument runway to permit all-weather operations.

Item 4. HTA hangar and operations facilities, $1,054,000.—Additional hangar space is required at Lakehurst to provide space for maintenance and operation of present station aircraft and those planned for the catapult test and arresting gear facility. The present field will be abandoned by heavier-than-air aircraft to make way for the new overhaul and repair department, airship accessories overhaul facilities. This is urgently needed to complete the new airfield as no hangar or operations structures now exist.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McHenry have these items been advance planned?

Captain McHENRY. Yes, sir, as follows:

Catapult and arresting gear facilities: Bureau of Yards and Docks (no charge).
Airship envelope storage: W. W. Slocum Co., Newark, N. J., $3,300.
Air navigation aids: Wigton, Abbott Corp., Plainfield, N. J., $5,550.
Heavier than air hangar and operations facilities: Wigton, Abbott Corp., Plainfield, N. J., $7,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This committee will stand adjourned until 1 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order.

NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER, PATUXENT RIVER, MD.

We will pick up the next item which is reflected as being the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md., in which there is a total request for $8,677,000, and this is made up of 4 requirements, to-wit, airfield pavement, jet engine maintenance shop, central heating system, and aviation lube oil storage.

I note at this installation the plant value is $91,317,529; funded construction not in plant value, $9,562,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $9,327,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $9,327,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $9,309,000.

I notice your heaviest item is the first one, airfield pavement, in the amount of $6,365,000. Will you present your justifications for that and the other requirements, please?

Captain McKINNEY. Part I of that item is the repair of the entire length of the runway. The major portion of this airfield pavement requires replacement. Numerous runway paving failures have occurred during the past years, and at an increased and alarming rate during the last 2 years since the operation of the latest type aircraft. Spot repairs are costly and disrupt schedules.

Part II is for an aircraft parking apron of 36,000 square yards. Lack of sufficient parking area requires aircraft to park on taxiways causing congestion and presents a hazard to taxiing aircraft.

Part III is for a parallel addition to taxiway A required to save the time and fuel necessary for positioning the planes before and after takeoff. It will reduce the existing congestion and interference during takeoffs from this field, sir.

The next item is a jet engine maintenance shop with an overhead crane. Shop facilities must be provided for maintenance, minor overhauling, and service evaluation of all turbojet and turboprop engines in support of aircraft test projects conducted by the Naval Air Test Center. This proposed shop will adequately handle the heaviest and longest jet engines foreseeable in the next 10 to 15 years.

The next item is a central heating system to rehabilitate the existing standby steam-electric generating plant. This will eliminate 60 of the 75 individual steam-generating plants on the station. By a series of loops, this central heating plant can supply heat to all buildings in the southwest portion of the station. The elimination of the 60 individual heating plants by this item can be amortized in a 3-year period.

The next item is aviation lube oil storage. At the present time aviation engine lubricating oil is procured in 55-gallon drums. Oil is dispensed by hand to tank trucks by hoisting the drums over the tank with a fork lift and pouring from this position. This item is to provide a safe method and a more efficient method of operation which will provide direct reductions in operating cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, with reference to the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md., has this been engineered and if so to what extent, by whom, when, and what was the cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The engineering for the pavements was done by the Bureau of Yards and Docks at Government expense during the past 6 months. The other items have been engineered as follows:

Jet engine maintenance building: John M. Walton & Associates, Arlington, Va., $5,022.
Central heating system: DPWO-PRNC.
Aviation lubricating oil storage: C. Warren Bogan & Associates, Washington, D. C., $350.

NAVAL AIR MISSILE TEST CENTER, POINT MUGU, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, gentlemen, naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif. The request is composed of four subsidiary projects, project aircraft maintenance building, radio receiver facility, special project building No. 2, and fire station, all of them totaling a request of $1,010,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $28,195,929; funded construction not in plant value, $6,620,000; existing unfunded authorization, $102,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,102,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,186,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $26,920,000.

Will you make your presentation for that requirement?

Captain MCKINNEY. The first item is a project aircraft maintenance building. This is required to provide aircraft maintenance facilities to support drone and project aircraft on San Nicolas Island where no facility now exists. It provides for the construction of a steel hangar building 110 feet wide by 80 feet deep with concrete floor and foundation and masonry unit leanto for shop and office.

The next item is a radio receiver facility. This is to provide a new interference-free permanent concrete building and related technical facilities plus two 600-square-foot direction finder buildings and access roads.

Item 3 is for a special project building to be used for the operation preparation and checkout of missiles equipped with special warheads, in connection with the naval air missile test center at Point Mugu.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Point Mugu works closely in its functions with Inyokern, does it not?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, it does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

Captain MCKINNEY. Item 4 is a fire station, for which we are requesting $84,000. This particular item was authorized under Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do we not have a fire station at Point Mugu?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is for a fire station on San Nicolas Island. It is a flight landing zone of the Mugu Naval Air Missile

Test Center. At present San Nicolas has a requirement for a standard class C station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Two of these projects are on San Nicolas and two are on Point Mugu proper, is that correct?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was or was not this fire station reflected in last year's budget and rejected because of its so-called excessive cost?

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is another item in the group wherein the House Appropriations Committee last year questioned our criteria for a firehouse and told us to review it, using the data that the Air Force uses, and that we were to get together on these various facilities, and we were able to reduce the cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From $102,000 to $84,000?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. It has been reviewed by the Department of Defense and it is in accordance with its criteria.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While we are on that subject, have all the installation costs that represent a differential costwise between the Air Force and the Navy been reviewed by the Department of Defense?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir, every item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has this project been engineered, and if so when, and by whom, and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The 4 items have been engineered by 4 separate contractors in the past 6 months, as follows:

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.

Project aircraft maintenance building, Holmes & Narver, Inc., Los Angeles	[1] $1,690
Radio receiver facility, Moffatt & Nichols, Inc., Long Beach	[1] 3,000
Special project building No. 2, Ralph M. Parsons Co., Los Angeles	[1] 2,150
Fire station, DPWO–11ND	------

[1] Estimate by prorating with other items in same engineering services contract.

NAVAL AIR STATION, SOUTH WEYMOUTH, MASS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, which is the naval air station, South Weymouth, Mass., wherein you request $270,000 for a radar test tower.

I note at this installation the plant value is $14,399,333; funded construction not in plant value, $1,773,152; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $270,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $270,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $5,692,000.

Will you present your justifications for that requirement, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is to provide for the installation of airborne early warning and aircraft intercept radar systems on the roof of hangar No. 1, an elevator to the roof of the hangar; an extension to the west control tower for the installation of the new ultrahigh frequency defense early warning radar; and one level of the extension to provide space necessary for the Reserve combat information center program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a part of the so-called radar circle?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. This is just a defense-early-warning radar, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And would serve what geographical area?

Admiral CLARK. May we go off the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been advance planned?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir; by Goldberg, Le Messurier & Associates of Boston for $2,500.

NAVAL PHOTOGRAPHIC INTERPRETATION CENTER, SUITLAND, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected as Naval Photographic Interpretation Center, Suitland, Md., for the first increment of which you are making a request for $2,345,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,345,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,345,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,776,000.

Will you present your justifications for this request, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, this Center must have a building suitable for storing and preserving the valuable films and prints of the Department, sir, and it is proposed to establish this new building there with the necessary humidity controls and cooling systems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is the Center located now?

Captain MCKINNEY. The present building at the naval receiving station has been condemned by the Potomac River Naval Command, under whose jurisdiction it is presently located, as a hazard to personnel and equipment.

Admiral CLARK. I might say, Mr. Chairman, we had two meetings during the year and it was said by the commander that if this did not go through he would request the Department to lease space. I have seen pictures of it. They have had to take personnel out of some of the lower floors because they are not sure they would not collapse.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this near Anacostia?

Admiral CLARK. It is at Anacostia. If you go across the bridge and turn right it is the air station; if you turn left it is the receiving station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not a very old building, is it?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; it is an old building and they have a lot of heavy equipment and weights in there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that the building where they recover the silver?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is in the main building?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has caused the sinking on that property, excessive weight or insufficient foundations?

Admiral CLARK. I think this land is filled. The building foundations are going down and we have pictures, I think.

Captain MCKINNEY. They are temporary buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the relationship of that building with the main building interoperationally?

Admiral CLARK. At this building they do two things. The main thing they do is interpret photographs for several activities of the Government, and if we may go off the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has this project been engineered and if so by whom, when, and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. This project was advance planned by John G. Leohler of Washington, D. C., in the past 6 months for $3,750.

LAND ACQUISITIONS AND OBSTRUCTION REMOVAL FOR FLIGHT CLEARANCE, NAVAL AIR STATIONS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance, naval air stations, various locations, wherein you are requesting $23 million.

You have supplied the committee with a breakdown list of each place, its geographical location, and the acreage involved. There is a total involvement of 10,840 acres to be acquired in fee and easements to be procured on an estimated 95,520 acres, all of which resolves itself in a total of $23 million.

I understand, gentlemen, that you have some moving pictures that will give the committee a better clarification of your requirements than going into the detailed justifications. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well, you will proceed with your moving pictures.

(Motion pictures with accompanying narration were shown to the committee.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The motion pictures were very interesting.

We will next place in the record the breakdown of stations under the land acquisition requirement.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance

Station	Area acres		Estimated cost including improvements
	Fee	Easement	
*ALF, Alice-Orange, Tex	140	1,390	$51,400
NAAS, Barin Field, Ala	1,350	2,300	409,000
*MCAS, Beaufort, S. C		840	445,000
*NAAS, Brown Field, Calif	60	2,260	408,500
NAS, Brunswick, Maine	110	1,280	332,900
*NAS, Cecil Field, Fla	400	2,300	680,000
MCAS, Cherry Point, N. C		4,000	20,000
*NAAS, Chincoteague, Va	600	640	770,000
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex		1,560	377,100
*ALF, Crows Landing, Calif	200	1,620	786,900
*MCALF, Edenton, N. C	60	530	757,200
*NAAS, El Centro, Calif	220	5,000	625,800
*MCAS, El Toro, Calif		5,360	578,800
*NAAS, Fallon, Nev	1,450	970	295,100
*NALF, Fentress, Va	60	1,060	1,470,000
NAAS, Glynco, Ga	630	1,630	220,000
*NAAS, New Iberia, La		2,140	210,500
NAS, Johnsville, Pa		260	116,800
NAS, Key West, Fla	700	150	293,000
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif		2,130	576,000
*NALF, Mayport, Fla	600		301,000
NAS, Memphis, Tenn	200		25,000
MCAS, Miami, Fla		1,200	50,000
*NAS, Miramar, Calif	30	900	275,000
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif	500		3,750,000
*MCAAS, Mojave, Calif		2,300	205,500
NAS, Oceana, Va	100	2,270	2,045,000
*NATC, Patuxent, Md	80	200	650,000
NAS, Pensacola, Fla		1,000	419,000
NAMTC, Port Mugu, Calif		1,560	106,000
NAAS, Port Isabel, Tex	280	1,800	61,600
MCAF, Santa Ana, Calif		2,710	171,000
NAAS, Saufley Field, Fla	1,000	2,960	1,269,000
NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash	100	5,560	253,600
*OLF, Whitehouse Field, Fla	1,100	2,500	679,000
NAS, Whiting Field, Fla	870	4,550	338,000
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa		200	392,000
*NAAS, Chase Field, Tex		3,040	111,500
*NAAS, Kingsville, Tex		7,280	268,900
OLFS, Pensacola, Fla		18,070	2,134,900
Total	10,840	95,520	23,000,000

NOTE.—The fields marked with an asterisk are fleet carrier landing practice fields.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This total land acquisition requirement is not in any manner a part or parcel of the land acquisitions reviewed in your budget prior to taking up this particular page or segment thereof, is it?

Admiral RUSSELL. This is separate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Completely separate?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, I would like to address the following question to you: Have all these land easements on this list been estimated or appraised?

Captain MCHENRY. They have been estimated and I would like Mr. Tiencken to go into detail as to the degree.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like my question answered by whoever here can answer it insofar as the projects on this list are concerned.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The estimates have been prepared by the Bureau of Yards and Docks based on preliminary appraisals obtained from local appraisers at each of the areas. Appraisals have been made in about 80 percent of the locations.

The appraisers were not aware of the various limitations which the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy discussed and finally agreed upon in arriving at the items which would be put in the budget, so that the estimates of the appraisers were used by personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks to fit the specific limitations which the Secretary of Defense gave us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are telling us is that this is not a presentation literally of the results of the appraisers' reports?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The appraisers, generally speaking, covered more territory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you mean more territory or more money?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Both area and money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, they did appraise larger land requirements than are reflected on this breakdown, and when their figures came in they also reflected greater and lesser amounts of money; or were they all greater?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Greater. The program was reduced.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That develops a very interesting situation. In the first place, you go out and employ local appraisers presumably to get persons conversant with land values in the particular area involved, and you pay them money for performing that service. Then when you get the results of their appraisals, you bring them into the Washington level and reduce the acreage requirement, which is your prerogative, and then second guess them as to cost?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We used the figures they gave us, but reduced them to take care of the acreage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you did not change the estimates, but you changed the land acreage which in turn reduced the cost?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Still adhering to the original cost as appraised by the local appraisers?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That clarifies your statement or my misconstruction of your statement.

What was the reason, after you had originally obtained your estimates, that you changed your mind as to the acreage requirement in the instances where the acreage has been lessened?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The Department of Defense reviewed this program and, based on the Air Force requirements, set the Navy Standards to fit the Air Force's standards. They did not want us to acquire as much land as we had proposed since the carrier approach program had been curtailed by the Department of Defense and we had originally included it in the Navy's program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If I interpret your statement correctly, the Navy had one concept of its clearance requirements for safety purposes and those who finally reviewed the issue had another concept which caused them to lessen it; is that correct?

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is substantially correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it is only substantially correct, tell me what is wrong.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The Navy's program and the Air Force's program on standard approach zones are substantially the same. The Navy has the added program for carrier approach which the Air Force does not have. The Secretary of Defense has limited us to the

standard approach zone plus the right to buy those rights and remove those physical obstructions which are in the carrier approach zone but not to include the entire area; only where there is an existing carrier approach obstruction.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. While you are not buying all the land to the right and left, you are accomplishing the same safety requirements or prerequisites by getting easements on the right and left sides of your approaches and eliminating any obstructions that might be in your way?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. TIENCKEN. We have the right if the obstruction is there now.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It occurs to me that we are spending a lot of money here for the purpose of safety, safety in landing and safety in take-off, not only as safety applies to the human equation involved but safety to the planes being flown by the pilots. It would seem to me that if you are going to do a safety job, it might be well to do it completely regardless of a procedure that another form of aviation might have conceived. I am not quarreling with their concept. It may cover their requirements satisfactorily; that I do not know; but it would occur to me from prior experience that it would have been cheaper and sounder to take no chances on placing yourselves in a position where later on you would have to spend greater sums to acquire the necessary acreage. It further occurs to me that the present formula indicates you might have to do that, that is, spend more money by going back later and improving the situation that should be taken in its entirety now. Is that a correct assumption on my part, gentlemen?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The Secretary of Defense permitted us to come in this year with this as the first increment. He has referred the matter to a committee to investigate the entire approach clearance problem and when that committee has reported, he will probably adjust his sights accordingly. In any case, when we buy we will get sufficient rights to cover us in the future so that we will not have to buy from the same individual a second time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can only assume from that procedure that apparently we did not have the set of personalities we do now when the original plan was formulated, or we would have made the survey then instead of making it later. What I am trying to figure is why this hiatus. Your explanation covers it to a point, but not to my satisfaction. I am not criticizing your presentation, but we have been told time after time in the past that when you have to acquire land the economic thing to do is acquire it all at the first shot.

Mr. TIENCKEN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If that is the yardstick of experience in the past, I am wondering why we do not apply the yardstick of experience here instead of doing it in a piecemeal manner. I understand your presentation, but that does not justify it in my mind.

What was the total reduction on account of the procedure that you have just testified to?

Admiral CLARK. We originally requested clearances on 40 fields and on review they were reduced to 19.

Mr. HANABURY. We went from $41 million down to $23 million.

Admiral RUSSELL. Of these 40 fields in which we are requesting land or navigation easements only 19 are specified for carrier landing practice.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down to you I want you to indicate on this list the fields that are in that carrier landing category as compared to the others, will you please?

Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir. The fields marked with an asterisk in the list on page 537 are fleet carrier landing practice fields.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On any one of these bases what would you consider would be the amount of practice landings per day, and when I say per day I will cover that in two shifts, daylight and darkness, and would like an estimate of both, picking out your field of greatest number and smallest number.

Admiral RUSSELL. We are asking for 10 Navy fleet support CLP fields, 5 on each coast; 4 Marine fleet support CLP fields, 2 on the west coast, 2 on the east coast; 4 advanced training command fields in the Louisiana-Texas area; and one research and development field for carrier landing practice for carrier suitability test at Patuxent River.

If you like I can provide a statement for the record in which this is summarized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On all these fields?

Admiral RUSSELL. Giving the reason, the hours to be flown, and pilots assigned to each.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it would be well if you did that at this point in the record so that we can have this clarified.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

FIELD CARRIER LANDING PRACTICE

The question was raised, "Why does the Navy need so many airfields cleared for carrier landing practice?"

We are requesting appropriation for clearance for field carrier landing practice for 19 of the 39 fields included in this program.

These 19 fields, urgently required, fall into categories as follows: 10 Navy fleet support CLP fields, 5 on each coast; 4 Marine fleet support CLP fields, 2 on the west coast, 2 on the east coast; 4 advanced training command fields in the Louisiana-Texas area; 1 research and development FCLP for carrier suitability test at Patuxent River.

Let me take a typical example of the requirement for field carrier landing practice at a place which is a major center for fleet aviation, namely the Norfolk-Oceana complex. This complex bears the load of training up of air groups for a large segment of the Atlantic Fleet. Here the air groups in succession spend approximately 6 months training up for their deployments at sea. This places an approximately constant load of 300 attack carrier air group pilots who require refresher field carrier landing practice. This varies from the full training in A/C type in the case of a new pilot of some 8 landings in 20 periods, on down to second cruise pilots who may require considerably less than that.

The foregoing requires the full day usage of a field for 240 days per year. So far I have spoken only of the attack carrier pilots; there are some 155 antisubmarine pilots who require the usage of a field for 70 days per year. This gives us a rough total of 310 working days per field.

Now, in the Norfolk area, certain days are lost during a calendar year as follows: 46 bad weather, with additional 12 partial bad days. We lose 11 days in the accumulated total because of aircraft nonavailability to carry out schedule; 36 days are accounted for by unfavorable wind; 36 days are lost due to gaps in schedules because of shipboard work and for other reasons; 84 days are Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, but even a quarter of these days are used for field carrier landing

practice. To summarize, a total of 535 landing-practice days are required in this area. To satisfy that requirement, the clearance and protection of two carrier landing practice fields are requested in this program, namely, Fentress and Chincoteague.

A similar analysis of night carrier landing practice requirements shows a need for 340 nights. Here again, to satisfy this requirement, we asked for Fentress and Chincoteague clearance. A similar analysis may be made for the Jacksonville-Cecil area. Here the weather factor is more favorable but the pilot load is greater.

Approximately 605 attack carrier pilots plus 234 special-unit pilots (photographic night fighters) are in training constantly in this area. Accordingly, 3 carrier landing practice fields, Cecil, Whitehouse, and Mayport, are requested.

It should be pointed out that these carrier landing practice fields are used also for other purposes although their use is intensive for the purpose we have explained.

Support fleet aviation on the west coast, the greatest concentration is in the San Diego-Miramar complex, where we are asking for carrier landing practice field clearance for Miramar, Brown Field, and El Centro, and 2 fields in the Alameda-Moffett area, where there is a lighter concentration of fleet aviation. These fields are Crows Landing and Fallon.

I have explained the need for 10 Navy fleet support carrier landing practice fields, 5 on each coast.

In the case of the Marine Corps complexes, we are requesting two carrier practice landing fields on each coast, Edenton for the Cherry Point complex and Beaufort for the Beaufort complex. On the west coast, El Toro and Mojave for the El Toro complex. These are not considered sufficient entirely in view of the fact that there are about 450 pilots in each of the 3 Marine air wings to be carrier qualified. We shall probably return to you in the future for two carrier landing practice fields on the east coast.

Four carrier landing practice fields are requested in the Advanced Training Command. These are required for the prosecution of our jet pilot training program.

The one final carrier landing practice field is the Bureau of Aeronautics Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, where all naval carrier aircraft go through carrier suitability tests prior to acceptance by the Navy for production. Field carrier landings are an important part of the carrier suitability tests of our new aircraft at this station.

I should like to say finally that, as our country grows, we can look to ever-increasing difficulties in securing these essential clearance features around our airfields. It is most urgent that we act now to protect our investment of some 1.5 billions of dollars in our naval airfields throughout the country which are included in this program, to the end that our fleet aviators may have the essential room in which to train, and that we of the Navy will have facilities in being from which to expand in time of national emergency.

Aviation Facilities—Overseas

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up "Public works construction, aviation facilities, overseas," and the first item is reflected as the naval air station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands, wherein you are requesting a total of $6,525,000, and this amount is made up of 5 items, taxiway, operating areas and parking areas; bachelor officers' quarters; utilities and roads; operations building and control tower; and maintenance and repair hangar. I note at this installation the plant value is $13,517,988; funded construction not in plant value, $9,767,048; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $6,525,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $6,525,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $35,188,000.

Will you present your requirements and your justifications, please?

Captain McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, item 1 is for the taxiway, operating areas, and parking areas. The south station operating area has not sufficient parking area for assigned aircraft and transient aircraft utilizing the field. At the present time the air station is constructed so that the south limit is on the bank and it is necessary to move them over to the north side of this field. A good many of the items involved in this project are related to transferring some of the activities over to the other side of the field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While you are transferring the activities from south to north, what are you going to do with the facilities presently on the south side?

Captain McKINNEY. They will be utilized, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What purposes are you going to use them for if you are going to construct like facilities on the north side?

Captain McKINNEY. This is related to the expanded facilities.

Admiral CLARK. I believe Mr. Hanabury has been to Guam and can answer that.

Mr. HANABURY. This is to continue the movement from the north to the south side. In the Jelley housing program authorized a couple years ago most of our Jelley housing on Guam was on the north side of the field. We have since gotten money for housing and messing facilities on the south side of the field. This is to continue that program. The bachelor officers' quarters will be located on the old site of the field. This is merely to continue the buildup on Guam with permanent type construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the same explanation carry for your bachelor officers' quarters?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir; this is an increment.

Captain McKINNEY. There are currently 40 permanent bachelor officers' quarters rooms at the naval air station at Agana. The other officers are billeted in old quonsets which are unsafe in high winds common to this area. Of 346 officers assigned, 154 occupy married officers' quarters, leaving a BOQ requirement of 192. This item provides 76 BOQ rooms which with the 40 existing will provide permanent quarters for all officers through double bunking of junior officers. Without this item officers must continue to live in substandard quarters unsafe in high wind and typhoon conditions.

Captain McKINNEY. The next item is utilities and roads.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For which you are requesting $1,072,000?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes.

Mr. HANABURY. That is going into practically virgin territory.

Captain McHENRY. Additional roads and walks, power lines, telephone lines, water lines, and sewer lines are required in order to utilize the new operating area on the south side of the field and to provide necessary connections and tie-ins for new housing to the main utilities and road systems. Failure to provide these facilities will prevent full use of the housing area of the new operations area.

Captain McKINNEY. The next item is the second increment of the operations building and control tower.

The first increment of the operations building and control tower nearing completion will not provide complete facilities for the operations department of the air station. This item will provide for the

completion of this building. Failure to provide these facilities will force a split in the operations department between the north and south sides of the field which is inimical to effective functioning of this department.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have a requirement for a maintenance and repair hangar for which you are requesting $1,800,000. What type of hangar will you build costing that much?

Mr. HANABURY. This will have a 150-foot span, a standard aircraft hangar. We have no hangar at the naval air station at Agana for the maintenance of aircraft and the four nose hangars on the north side do not afford protection for aircraft and personnel from the weather.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered, Captain, and if so, when, by whom, and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. All items have been engineered by the Marianas area public works officer within the past year at Government expense.

UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, ARGENTIA, NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item "United States naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland," wherein you are making a request for $8,589,800, comprised of 2 subsidiary requirements, aircraft operations building and family housing for 24 senior officers, 69 junior officers, and 270 enlisted.

I note at this installation the plant value is $49,103,961; funded construction not in plant value, $27,854,535; existing unfunded authorization, $1,016,623; the proposed 1956 authorization, $8,589,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $8,589,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, $25,935,000.

Make your presentation for this requirement, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. Item 1 "Operations building and control tower and crash facilities," is the standard operations building. As you know, this particular station is carrying out a classified mission.

The present building includes provision for crash crews, not normally housed in the operations building. This building violates BuAer flight safety criteria with respect to two runways, and is of temporary construction subject to high maintenance in order to keep it habitable. This item provides a standard operations building and a crash truck building located in consonance with flight safety criteria.

The family housing item is for a total of $7,515,800 for 300 family housing units urgently required to partially alleviate the shortage of 706 units of family housing for personnel assigned to this isolated location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you reflect a unit cost for the senior officer field grade requirement of $35,000, and junior officer, company grade, of $27,360. What is the unit cost for the enlisted people? That is not reflected here. The total is, but the unit cost is not reflected.

Captain MCFARLAND. It is $23,130. That is $12,850 times the cost factor of 1.8.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this requirement been engineered; if so, by whom, at what time and cost?

Captain MCHENRY. With the exception of the housing, the other projects have been advance planned by Clark, Buhr & Nexsen of Norfolk, Va., within the past year at a cost of $60,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan

Mr. Sheppard. If there are no further questions, pick up the next item reflected as "Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan," wherein you are asking for a total of $1,978,800, comprised of 2 requirements, to wit, bachelor officers' quarters and family housing for 7 senior officers, 23 junior officers and 60 enlisted.

I note at this installation the plant value is $290,142; funded construction not in plant value, $3,282,701; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,978,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,978,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, $9,154,000.

Present your justification for this requirement, please.

Captain McKinney. The bachelor officers' quarters for which we are requesting $464,000 is to overcome the overload at this station. The present BOQ capacity is 283 rooms. The average load on this building has been 459 with a peak of 594.

This is an isolated station and it is necessary to have quarters on the station for the bachelor officers' quarters.

The next item is family housing for 90 units, for which the request is $1,514,800. Currently a deficiency exists for 100 Marine officers' quarters and 201 Marine enlisted quarters for support of personnel assigned to this station. No Navy public quarters exist on this station at the present time.

Mr. Sheppard. I notice the senior officers' quarters reflect a unit cost of $24,300, whereas in the previous requirement at Argentia it was $35,000; and for junior officers' quarters this reflects a cost of $18,240, yet for the same thing at Argentia, Newfoundland, it was $27,360. In other words, there is a peculiarity of mathematics here—$24,300 against $35,000, and then we go in reverse with $18,240 as against $27,360.

Admiral Clark. The cost factor at Argentia is 1.8 and, at Japan, it is 1.2. So everything is more expensive at Argentia.

Mr. Sheppard. Captain, has this been engineered; if so, by whom, when, and at what cost?

Captain McHenry. This project has been advance planned by the officer in charge of construction for the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Japan, during the past year at Government expense.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item "Naval Station, Bermuda," wherein you are requesting $91,000 to replace nose hangar.

I note at this installation the plant value is $30,680,187; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $91,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $91,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $10,527,000.

Present your justification for this item, please.

Captain McKinney. The present nose hangar has been condemned as unsafe and does not provide sufficient clearance to permit working on P5M aircraft. A new one is required to perform routine maintenance checks so that the main hangar can be used for more extensive maintenance. This provides a replacement nose

hangar with sufficient clearance for present aircraft. Lack of a nose hangar will seriously delay maintenance of aircraft with a loss of availability of aircraft for prescribed missions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has advance planning been done; if so, by whom, what was the time and cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The project was advance planned by Richard Struckman & Neuman of Miami, Fla., within the past 6 months, for $750.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, CUBI POINT, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Naval Air Facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands," wherein you are making a request for $8,489,000. The total request comprises 12 other expenditure requirements broken down in the justifications before us.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in plant value, $39,548,000; existing unfunded authorization, $229,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $8,260,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $8,489,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $31,891,000.

Make your presentation for this requirement, addressing yourself particularly to the item "Airfield development" in the sum of $2 million and, after that, to the item "Aircraft parking area" in the sum of $1,585,000.

Captain MCKINNEY. As you probably know, this is a new station which is under construction and proposed for activation in fiscal year 1956. For the airfield development, previous appropriations were not sufficient to accomplish the necessary grading and paving because of the terrain and land difficulties they have run into out there in construction.

Perhaps Captain McHenry can go into the detail a little more as to the construction difficulties.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why did you run out of money if it was adequately and properly engineered?

Captain MCHENRY. I would like to call on Commander Maley. Your question deals with the cost of the work at Cubi Point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct. In other words, we ran into a deficiency, did we not, on the job?

Commander MALEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was what was the cause of the deficiency if it was adequately engineered in the first instance?

Commander MALEY. It was initially planned to accomplish the construction at Cubi Point with military personnel—Seabees. It developed, as the job progressed, that the Seabee personnel could not be kept available to complete the work and that has been the major factor in the increased cost. We have had to go to contract operations in lieu of the Seabee work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much was originally appropriated for the job?

Commander MALEY. I will have to supply that for the record.

(The following information was submitted later:)

Fiscal year 1953, $20,173,000.
Fiscal year 1954 authorization, $5,654,000 (funded from savings).

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who did the engineering, if your records reflect it?

Captain MCHENRY. For this project?

Mr. SHEPPARD. For this project, a deficiency was created because of lack of Seabees which caused the contractual function you had to effect, plus the fact of the deficiency in engineering that showed up. Who was responsible for that discrepancy?

Captain MCHENRY. I do not think there is any engineering discrepancy. There has been a change in the type of operation. The Seabee personnel that first entered into the cost picture of the work were not available, within their commitments, to do this in the time required; therefore, it had to be changed to a contract operation, which is more costly, in order to accomplish it in the required time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There was no change in the construction formula or facilities laid down?

Captain MCHENRY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It followed the original concept and the deficiency was strictly due to the lack of Seabees to do the job?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir; and independent engineering was performed by Bechtel Corp. at an estimated cost of $50,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you get down to your office, I wish you would take a look at that particular operation and see if you want to correct your answer as to the engineering aspect.

Captain MCHENRY. Very well.

Captain MCKINNEY. Now you asked for the aircraft parking area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have $1,585,000 for that.

Captain MCKINNEY. This is to provide a parking area for assigned aircraft and disbursal areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a new project, or is this a workover?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is really a first increment, representing an existing need for 363,000 square yards of parking area. 108,600 square yards have been provided and this item is for 121,000 square yards. An additional 134,000 square yards will be included in future budgets. The following are the remaining line items in our request for this station:

Item 1. Hangar, $523,000.—Previous appropriations were not sufficient to construct the hangar lean-to due to abnormal costs to repair construction equipment and the loss of the experienced Seabee personnel counted on in original estimates. Replacement of these personnel delayed construction and raised construction costs. This item provides funds to complete the planned hangar. The hangar is required for the shop area to perform aircraft maintenance.

Item 2. Enlisted barracks, $409,000.—Previous appropriations were not sufficient to construct the authorized barracks due to the same causes as in the case of the maintenance hangar. This item provides funds necessary to construct the last of the 172-man barracks buildings previously authorized. No barracks are available at the station for planned EM assignment.

Item 3. Communications and electronics, collateral (2d increment), $235,000.—Previous appropriations were not sufficient to procure the electronics collateral due to the same reasons outlined for the hangar. This item provides funds necessary to complete procurement of the required communications and electronics collateral.

Item 4. Sewage disposal system (3d increment), $90,000.—Funds provided for the present sewage disposal system are not sufficient to provide for development of the areas included in this year's program. This item will provide for sewage development in support of the fiscal year 1956 program for this station. Failure to provide these funds will mean that no sewage disposal facilities will be available for any buildings constructed as a result of this year's programs.

Item 6. Roads, bridges, and drainage, $830,000.—Previous appropriations were not sufficient to construct the roads, bridges and drains due to the same reasons outlined for the hangar. This item provides funds necessary to complete these systems for this station.

Item 7. Armory, $61,000.—There is a permanent requirement to provide storage for small arms and small-arms ammunition and belting of such ammunition. No facilities existing can provide for this requirement. Lack of this facility will prohibit storage of required small-arms ammunition and belting of such ammunition for operational missions emanating from this station.

Item 8. High-speed jet refueling system, $823,000.—To handle refueling of jet aircraft operating from this station requires greater capacity than is available from refueling trucks. Four high-speed refueling stations are required for the one air group which is assigned to this activity. Provision of these stations will mean that full operational use can be made of aircraft assigned to this station.

Item 9. Recreation building, $769,000.—There are no indoor recreation or atheletics facilities available at this location for service personnel or their dependents. Provision of off-duty recreation is necessary to the maintenance of high morale of personnel assigned to isolated locations. Recreation facilities are urgently required for morale purposes.

Item 10. Aircraft parking area, $1,585,000.—To provide for parking area of assigned aircraft and dispersal areas required as a passive defense measure in this sensitive area 363,600 square yards of aircraft parking area are required at this station. One hundred and eight thousand six hundred square yards have been provided with funds from previous years' appropriations. Two hundred and fifty-five thousand square yards are still required. This item provides for 121,000 square yards. The aditional 134,000 square yards will be included in the fiscal year 1957 budget request.

Item 11. Seadrome dredging, $935,000.—Previously funded seadrome dredging is insufficient. First, the original hydrographic information was incomplete and more dredging is required to secure required depth and, second, the borrow expected from original dredging was insufficient for required fill due to the consistency of the dredged material. This item provides for 935,000 cubic yards of dredging to meet this requirement.

Item 12. Fire station, $229,000.—Public Law 534, 83d Congress, authorized the first increment of a one-company fire station for NAS Cubi Point. This was deferred when appropriations fell short of authorization. A two-company fire station is required at NAS Cubi Point in accordance with fire prevention and safety standards because of the extent of buildings located here. None exists. Funds to cover the previous authorization will cover construction of this required item. Valuable fire-fighting equipment is exposed to the ravages of this hot and humid climate. Operation of the fire department is hampered due to lack of berthing space for equipment.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

Mr. Sheppard. If there are no further questions, pick up the next item reflected as "Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba," where you are asking for $2,977,300, comprised of requirements for an enlisted men's swimming pool, water supply, jet fuel ready issue tanks and pipeline, and family housing for 2 junior officers and 25 enlisted. Those subdivisions create a total of $2,977,300.

I note at this installation the plant value is $18,300,892; funded construction not in plant value, $784,721; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,977,300; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,977,300; and the estimated future appropriation required $16,491,000.

Present your requirement of cost for the water supply and tell us what you are going to do there to the extent of $1,050,000.

Captain McKinney. The present water supply is inadequate and provides only a 2-day supply, and it is necessary to barge water from the main station to Leeward Point and transfer it to a 500,000-gallon storage tank. Three barges are used, which are old and subject to constant repair.

By construction of this project, $62,000 can be saved annually in this water supply system.

Other items included in this request are:

Item 1. Enlisted men's swimming pool, $208,000.—No swimming pools exist at the Leeward Point Field for survival training, physical conditioning, and recreation of assigned personnel. Many hours available for training are lost by the requirement of transporting personnel to McCalla Field for this training.

Item 3. Jet fuel ready issue tanks and pipeline, $1,227,000.—A fuel pipeline is required from McCalla Field to Leeward Point to eliminate the costly barge operation presently required to transport fuel between these points. This item provides for this pipeline. Failure to provide these funds will force continuation of the present costly barge transport system.

Item 4.—Family housing

	Number	Amount
(a) Junior officer (company grade) 1,125 square feet (average)	2	$42,560
(b) Enlisted quarters, 950 square feet (average)	25	449,740
Total	27	492,300

At the present time 4 officers and 40 enlisted men are separated from their families due to the lack of quarters at this station. In addition, 3 officers and 53 enlisted men's families are living in substandard public quarters and rental units which are substandard and in need of replacement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have these items been advance planned Captain McHenry?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir; as follows:

Swimming pool by the public works officer of the 10th Naval District.

Water supply—*Buck, Serfert & Yost, San Juan, Puerto Rico, $5,000* estimated.

Jet fuel facilities—*Maurice Connell, Miami, Fla., $6,000 estimated.*

Family housing on the basis of criteria furnished by the Secretary of Defense.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, IWAKUNI, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the "Naval air facility, Iwakuni, Japan," reflecting a request for $975,000, comprised of barracks and mess for enlisted, and bachelor officers' quarters.

I note at this installation the plant value is $853,000; funded construction not in plant value, $871,482; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $975,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $975,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,243,000.

Make your presentation for that requirement, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. The planned loading at this naval air facility is 2,900 enlisted personnel. The present barracks and messing capacity is 2,400. This proposed item will supply the deficiency presently existing at that station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know the Navy in the past has fed their people in relays, but I did not know you were sleeping them in relays.

Captain MCKINNEY. The overflow has been forced to live in tents and eat in shifts, thereby extending the feeding hours through most of the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McKinney, will you proceed with the next item, please?

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is a bachelor officers' quarters for $300,000.

Present officer strength of naval air facility, Iwakuni, is 360. Present bachelor officers' quarters design capacity is 112. All officers are double-bunked with the balance living in tents. This provides two 56-man bachelor officers' quarters, bringing design capacity up to 224. Housing of all officer personnel will be accomplished by double bunking where necessary. Suitable bachelor officers' quarters space is a vital necessity in maintaining high morale among officers' stations at locations such as this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, has this project been engineered; if so, by whom, when and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. It was engineered by the Officer-in-Charge of Yards and Docks in charge of contracting in Japan within the past year at Government expense.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION AT KANEOHE BAY, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Marine Corps Air Station at Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii," wherein you are asking for a total of $3,227,600 comprised of taxiway extension, high-speed jet refueling system, and family housing for 3 senior officers, 7 junior officers, and 45 enlisted.

I note at this installation the plant value is $44,912,598; funded construction not in plant value, $15,656,728; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,227,600; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,227,600; and the estimated future appropriation required, $25,009,000.

Make your presentation for this requirement, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. The taxiway extension that is required for full use of the main runway is 1,800 feet shorter than the runway. This prevents full use of the runway when aircraft require over 5,970 feet for a landing and ties up the runway until the landed aircraft can taxi back and off of the runway. This extension is necessary to alleviate this condition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any properties in the extension of this runway that are involved population-wise?

Captain MCKINNEY. No, sir. This is on the beach at Hawaii and on the island of Oahu, about 12 miles northeast of Honolulu.

Mr. ANDREWS. You already own the property?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McKinney, present your requirement for the next item, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is a high-speed jet-refueling system for $574,000.

One hundred jet aircraft are assigned to MCAS, Kaneohe. Bu Aer criteria requires 4 high-speed refueling stations to enable rapid refueling of the number of jet aircraft assigned for operational missions. No such stations currently exist. This item will provide for 2 stations with the remaining 2 to be provided in the fiscal year 1957 public-works program.

The next item is for family housing for $1,192,600, as follows:

	Number	Amount
(a) Senior officer (field grade)	3	$97,200
(b) Junior officer (company grade)	7	170,200
(c) Enlisted 950 square feet (average)	45	925,200
Total	55	1,192,600

Present housing facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of personnel assigned to this station. The current housing shortage will be further complicated by the recent assignment of a Marine regimental combat team to this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McKinney, what is the status of the engineering on these projects?

Captain MCKINNEY. The taxiway extension and the fueling stations were done by the public works officer of the 10th Naval District. The housing is in the same status as our other housing projects.

NAVAL STATION, KODIAK, ALASKA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska," for family housing wherein you are asking for 3 senior officer quarters, 12 junior officer, and 65 enlisted, for a total of $2,613,100.

I note at this installation the plant value is $43,366,000; funded construction not in plant value, $6,200,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,613,100; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,613,100; and the estimated future appropriation required, $24,283,000.

This seems like a pretty heavy figure for that amount of housing; what is your justification?

Captain MCKINNEY. At the present time, 50 officers and 100 enlisted personnel at this station are separated from their families due to the lack of adequate quarters at a reasonable cost.

I would like to have Captain McHenry go into the unit cost of these things at Kodiak.

Captain MCHENRY. The cost factor at Kodiak, Alaska, is 2.5 times stateside cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been engineered; if so, by whom, when, and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The housing has been estimated from criteria established by the Department of Defense the same as the other housing items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you say that is subject to the usual 5- to 10-percent variation?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir.

Captain MCFARLAND. This is subject to the same percentage variations as the other.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In fact, that same question and answer would apply to all of them that have been formulated upon the same criteria?

Captain MCFARLAND. That is correct. We still have a $35,000 maximum and 10-percent variation on the other items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item, "Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands," wherein you are making a request for $4,411,000 composed of transmitter facilities, ammunition magazines, and transient billeting.

I note at this installation the plant value is $21,953,667; funded construction not in plant value, $3,375,333; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $4,411,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,411,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $12,744,000.

I wish you would address yourself to the transmitter facilities for $3,318,000.

Captain McKinney. It is proposed to construct a new transmitter building with antenna on an island which is 3 miles from Kwajalein Island proper. The transmitter equipment at the naval station is located in quonset huts which are not weatherproofed. Equipment which normally lasts from 9 to 10 years must be replaced in 3 years, which not only raises the maintenance cost, but interferes with the reliability of the equipment.

Mr. Sheppard. Is this item predicated upon the same expansion program as those we have heretofore inquired into?

Captain McKinney. Yes, sir. Kwajalein Islands have a facility to support the regular operation of transport aircraft and to provide support for incidental vessels.

Mr. Sheppard. In this instance, what are the collaterals to the extent of the $91,000 item?

Admiral Clark. That is the radio equipment that goes into the transmitter facility.

Mr. Sheppard. Are there any questions?

Mr. Ostertag. The property involved in this station amounts to 5,248 acres. Is that on Kwajalein Island?

Captain McKinney. The main island is 3 miles long by about half a mile wide. It is really a group of islands.

Mr. Ostertag. Marshall Islands?

Captain McKinney. Yes, sir.

Admiral Clark. I think there should be a decimal point there. I think Mr. Ostertag has picked out a typographical error, and that acreage should be 524.8.

Mr. Ostertag. 524 instead of 5,248?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ostertag. It seems to be considerable acreage to me in light of the size of this island, and I just wondered if any property existed there outside of that owned by the Navy. In other words, the record should show that the present ownership is 524.8 acres.

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ostertag. And there is no acquisition involved?

Captain McKinney. No, sir.

Mr. Ostertag. And this project is only part of an estimated future program of some $12 million out of a total value of $21,953,000 as of today?

Captain McKinney. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. Proceed with your other requirements, Captain.

Captain McKinney. We have two other items.

Item 2. Ammunition magazines, $288.000.—There is a requirement for storage of high explosive ammunition at naval station, Kwajalein. No facilities exist which can be used for this purpose. This item covers the construction of four HE magazines and a fuse and detonator magazine to meet this requirement.

Item 3. Transient billeting, $805,000.—Naval station Kwajalein, has an average load of 40 transient officers per night, with transient enlisted personnel approximating twice this figure. Peak loads are approximately double these numbers. Present buildings are deteriorated quonset huts which are crowded and insanitary with outside head facilities and are unsafe in high winds frequently encountered on the island. This item provides for 25 BOQ type rooms for transient officers on the basis of naval cadet type quarters and a 100-man dormitory for enlisted personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McHenry, have these items been engineered, and if so, by whom, when, and at what cost.

Captain MCHENRY. All items were planned by the district public works officer of the 14th Naval District at Government expense and within the last year.

NAVAL STATION, MIDWAY ISLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item reflected as "Naval station, Midway Island," wherein you are asking for $1,518,000 composed of transmitter facilities and air operation service ramp.

I note at this installation the plant value is $17,415,865; funded construction not in plant value, $1,048,414; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,518,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,518,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $19,153,000.

The transmitter facilities are indicated as being $1,153,000, which is the major portion of your request.

Present the justification for that requirement, please.

Captain MCKINNEY. With regard to the transmitter facility, the present equipment is located in unweatherproof quonset huts. Equipment normally lasting 9 to 10 years must be replaced in about 3 and not only raises the maintenance cost, but affects the reliability of the transmitter equipment.

This facility is to provide a weatherproof structure capable of housing and permitting transmitter air operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the utilities involved? Is that merely a transfer of utilities from one geographical area to another, or just what are the utilities to the tune of $81,000 that is required?

Captain MCKINNEY. The utilities include brakish water, distilled water, power, telephone, communications and sanitary facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice "collateral furnishings." What do you mean by furnishings?

Captain MCKINNEY. They include 22 pieces of electronic equipment and the installation of 364,000 nontechnical furnishings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, these furnishings should be interpreted as devices and not as furniture?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us proceed to the next item.

Captain MCKINNEY. The next item is an air operation service ramp, $365,000. The present ramp is unusable due to the inability to handle the wheel loading of heavy aircraft which utilize this field. This item provides for a 10-inch thick concrete service ramp 400 feet by 600 feet, adequate in size to handle heavy aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McHenry, have these items been advance planned?

Captain MCHENRY. Yes, sir. Both items were handled by the district public works officer of the 14th Naval District at Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is this site of 1,282 acres correct, Admiral, or should it be 128 acres?

Mr. HANABURY. That is 1,276 acres. There are two islands there, Sand Island and East Island.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What is the significance of the reduction in personnel construction? I note in your justification that the planned construction for enlisted men will be reduced from 813 to 491 and for civilian from 340 to 15; yet the number of aircraft operation of the present two is going to be increased to 30 enlisted and 5 civilian. Will someone explain the general nature of this operation?

Captain DAWSON. We are reducing the station to just a transport stop for the transport planes going across Midway. This is for the aviation end of it. That is where the big decrease in personnel comes.

Admiral CLARK. The number of communications people will stay stable. You notice we are asking for a transmitter, but the number of aviation people will be reduced.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, the main purpose of the operation will be a transport station and communication center.

Captain DAWSON. A transport stop and communication.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that the reason for the planned program of $19 million additional expenditures over and above the present value of $17 million?

Captain DAWSON. I will have to check the record, but it is the eventual replacement of existing World War II buildings.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This provides logistic support for the fleet, too.

Captain MCKINNEY. The ships come in there and refuel.

Mr. HANABURY. That sum is for the replacement of most of the World War II construction type structures. If we stay in there, we are going to have to phase in items to replace everything on the station. The transmitter program is the most crying, critical need; that is why it is in the program this year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The major criterion would be for the replacement of the buildings for the transmitter facilities and the like. That constitutes the $19 million in the planned program; is that correct?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; the reconstruction of runways and taxiways. There has to be a lighting system; brackish water distribution system; naval barracks, and so forth, and in effect to replace all of the living facilities.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The runways are going to be increased because of the contemplated use by transport planes; is that correct?

Mr. HANABURY. No; we would not have any direct requirement for increasing the length of the runway, but merely repaving. The longest runway there is 7,900 feet, and I do not think we would extend it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What is the planned program—not indicated in this justification, which is $1,500,000, but the estimated future appropriations required, listed as $19,153,000? What are the major items involved in your future requirements?

Mr. HANABURY. Those are the ones I just read.
Admiral CLARK. The replacement of temporary buildings.
Mr. OSTERTAG. Replacement of practically all of your facility?
Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

FLEET AIRCRAFT SERVICE SQUADRON 77, NAPLES, ITALY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item for Naples, Italy, where you are asking for $155,000, comprised of storage building, crash-crew garage and ready bunk room, $112,000 in the first instance and $43,000 in the other.

What is the justification for that requirement in Italy?

Captain MCKINNEY. This storage building is required to house the various activities at the Naples compound.

The mail center is located in the east hangar which is not completely weatherproof. This hangar area is urgently required for aircraft maintenance. In addition to the mail center, part of the hangar is being used for bulk storage, which, in itself, is a fire hazard, and further prevents use of the space for maintenance purposes. The item covers a building to house these activities and thereby free the hangar space for its intended purpose.

Item 2 is a crash-crew garage and ready bunk room, $43,000. This provides for a building to house crash equipment and bunk the crew which will protect valuable equipment from the elements and provide adequate bunking for crew personnel. No crash-crew garage exists at Naples and the crash crew bunks in a shack constructed of scrap lumber.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice in your breakdown under the title "Plant value," and so forth, no money; funded construction not in plant value, zero; existing unfunded authorization, zero; proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation, $155,000; and estimated future appropriations required, zero. That is indicative of the fact we are just visitors doing a little spot job here, or what is the answer?

Admiral CLARK. This is an Italian field which is also a NATO field. It is one of the fields where we entered into the Atlantic Treaty authorizing stations, wherein the post will supply certain facilities and, if we are going to operate them there, we will supply our share. We have nothing there now that we own and this is what we need over and above the NATO facilities to do our part of the air operations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You mean to bring it up to United States standards?

Admiral CLARK. In part, that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the personnel factor indicated here the personnel that is going to be living in this area, or on this project?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the present personnel is 39 officers and 393 enlisted and 46 civilian.

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. Are we paying the cost of operating that field?

Captain DAVIDSON. No, sir; we do not pay for the regular maintenance and such items as that. We pay for the support of our own group there, the service squadron, but not for the operation and maintenance of the field, except for such supplemental help as necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS. You want this money for post office people? This will be the only building you have there and you have none planned for the future?

Captain DAVISON. We have no construction program there. We are using some of our maintenance space in the hangar to conduct this fleet post office operation and therefore depriving ourselves of the maintenance of aircraft.

Mr. ANDREWS. Title to the building will go to the Italian Government in case we cease to operate there.

Captain DAVISON. Eventually, they would have title to the building if we vacate it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is this a post office building?

Captain DAVISON. For air delivery to the fleet carrier. It supports the air command of the Mediterranean Fleet.

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is listed as a storage building, item No. 1. Is that the item you are discussing?

Captain MCKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In your justification it is noted as a storage building.

Captain DAVISON. It is stored there until it is passed on to destination. It is not a local distribution of mail.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And the Italian Government would have title to this building after it has served our purpose; is that right?

Captain DAVISON. Yes, sir; at the time we vacated the property.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I notice you have listed a total of 54 civilians. Are they indigenous personnel, or American?

Captain DAVISON. They are indigenous.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How do you employ your indigenous personnel in Italy? Do you obtain them through the Italian Government, and are they screened by the Italian Government and recommended to you?

Captain DAVISON. Yes, sir. They are screened by post communications as in other areas. You asked, I believe, this question in the appropriation hearing last year. They are screened by the government in the locality and also screened by the United States Navy.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What assurance have we that they are not bad security risks?

Captain DAVISON. The combined investigations of both of our agencies indicate to us that they are sufficiently reliable for the work we give them to do.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are we required to take employees as they are screened, approved and recommended by the Italian Government, or do you have a right to exercise discretion?

Captain DAVISON. We have a discretion.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you deny employment where in your judgment it would not be wise for the United States Government to employ such persons?

Captain DAVISON. We retain that discretion.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you exercise it?

Captain DAVISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same question pertaining to the engineer techniques.

Captain MCHENRY. This project was advance planned by the Bureau of Yards and Docks during the past year at Government expense.

Naval Air Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item entitled "Naval Air Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco," composed of a cold storage building extension and family quarters for 4 senior officers, 16 junior officers, and 88 enlisted, wherein you make a total request for $1,958,500.

I note at this installation the plant value is $7,563,776; funded construction not in plant value, $37,436,224; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,958,500; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,958,500; and the estimated future appropriation required, $8,225,000.

Present your justification for that requirement, please.

Captain McKinney. With regard to the cold storage building, there is a requirement for 15,411 square feet of cold storage space at the naval air facility, Port Lyautey for $67,000. At the present time we only have 7,000 square feet of available space. This leaves a deficiency which must be supplied due to the heat and humidity at that station.

With respect to the family housing for 108 units estimated at $1,891,500. Currently 135 officers and 205 enlisted personnel are on the waiting list for public quarters with the expectation of waiting 18 months for quarters assignment. During that period they are separated from their families and this is a desire to satisfy that existing need.

Mr. Sheppard. In this instance, as in all others of like character, wherein an item is reflected as an estimated future appropriation request of $8,225,000, that is a projected estimate and is not a part of this proposed request?

Captain McKinney. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. Why did you put it in here in the first place?

Admiral Clark. We were asked to by the chairman of the other committee, sir.

(After a pause.)

Admiral Clark. I would like to correct my testimony. It was the previous chairman of this committee.

Mr. Sheppard. Apparently you people do not move with the times, do you?

Captain McKinney. There is estimated future housing requirement of 12 million 2.

Mr. Sheppard. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. Sheppard. Captain McHenry, have these projects been advance planned?

Captain McHenry. Yes, sir; the cold storage project was done by Reisner, Urban, Brayton & Burrow, of New York City, at an estimated cost of $700. The housing will be engineered on the basis of criteria furnished by the Department of Defense.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, naval station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R. You are asking for $3,721,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $34,660,483; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authoriza-

tion, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,721,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,721,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,102,000.

I wish you would present your justification for that requirement.

Captain McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, a requirement for an operable airfield exists in the Puerto Rican area. No such facilities now exist because of the lack of runway length to meet the needs occasioned by use of jet aircraft. This covers the lengthening of 1 runway to 8,000 feet, a parallel taxiway, parking area and a control tower; all mandatory items for safe and effective operation of an airfield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been engineered, if so, by whom, when, and how much did you pay for it?

Captain McHENRY. Engineered by the district public works officer of the 10th Naval District, at Government expense within the past year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where does that access road come from, gentlemen? What does the shopping list show on that?

Captain McKINNEY. If you made that trip from San Juan you know how long it took.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is why I am asking. Are you going to improve it by an access road?

Captain McHENRY. You have us unprepared, Mr. Chairman. We will furnish the information for the record.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS: EXPLANATION OF SUBITEM CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD AT AN ESTIMATED COST OF $60,000

The extension of runway 6–24 to the west, as requested in this program, will require that portion of the station access road be eliminated and be replaced by 5,000 feet of new road which will circumvent the end of the end zone to runway 6–24 as extended. This access road will connect with insular road No. 3. This access road also provides the main access for vehicular traffic into the station's operation area adjacent to the hangar.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At that price it looks more like a repair job than a new road in that area. Would that be right?

Captain McHENRY. It would seem so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would not have a $4.60 unit price for new construction, would you?

Captain McHENRY. I wouldn't think so, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to ask for a little more information on this item of $507,500 for site preparation and drainage.

You own the land, do you not?

Captain McKINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a big item, $507,500.

Captain McHENRY. Not being intimately familiar with the project, sir, site preparation generally is the removal of scrub growth, trees, and such other structural obstructions which might be there, as well as grading it in order to get a proper runoff of heavy rainfalls so you do not get soil erosion.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Naval Station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands

Mr. Sheppard. Next is naval station at Sangley Point, Philippine Islands, you want 1, senior officer (field grade) 1,500 square feet average; 2, junior officer (company grade) 1,125 square feet average; 3, enlisted quarters 950 square feet average, for a total of $522,900.

I note at this installation the plant value is $9,572,590; naval station, Sangley Point, funded construction not in plant value, $1,500,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorizations, $522,900; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $522,900; and the estimated future appropriation required, $11,138,000.

Present your justifications, please.

Captain McKinney. At the present time there are only eight sets of adequate public quarters available on this station; 357 families now are living in inadequate public quarters, or paying excessively high prices for private housing. This project is comprised of 1 senior officer quarters, 1 junior officer quarters, and 22 enlisted quarters.

Mr. Sheppard. Your unit cost is reflected as $30,375 in the senior officer; junior, $22,800; and enlisted quarters unit cost, $19,275.

What is the cost factor involved there, Captain?

Captain McHenry. 1.5 times stateside prices.

Mr. Sheppard. Has this project been engineered? If so, by whom, when, and how much did it cost?

Captain McHenry. This project has not been engineered. It falls in the same category as other housing projects.

Mr. Sheppard. Subject to the same variation?

Captain McHenry. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Any questions on that item, gentlemen?

(No response.)

Location Classified NAF No. 1, CINC NELM

Mr. Sheppard. We will proceed with the next item, classified location, naval air facility No. 1, NAF No. 1, CINC NELM. You are asking for $1,869,000. This comprises 13 subsidiary requirements reflecting the proportions of the total.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; NAF No. 1 CINC NELM, funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,869,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,869,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,589,000.

Present your justification discussion off the record for this requirement. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this item been engineered? If so, by whom, when, and what is the cost?

(Discussion held off the record.)

LOCATION CLASSIFIED AEW No. 2

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, gentlemen. Here is a classified location in which you are making request for a total of $19,099,200.

This is composed of 11 requirements under your total heading.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $19,099,200; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $19,099,200; and the estimated future appropriation required, $6,034,500.

You will proceed to explain to the committee the necessity of the funds requested off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered? If so, by whom, when, and at what cost?

(Discussion held off the record.)

CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS OVERSEAS—ADDITIONAL AVIATION FACILITIES, AEW No. 3

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected in our justification, also a classified location.

You are making request for $39,247,000.

This is comprised of 14 subsidiary requirements under your total dollar request.

I note at this installation the plant value is $43,366,000; AEW No. 3 funded construction not in plant value, $6,200,000; existing unfunded authorization, $1,327,053; the proposed 1956 authorization, $39,247,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $39,247,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $28,918,000.

I would appreciate it if you would present your justifications for this requirement off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, what is the engineering aspect of this situation in accordance with the previous questions?

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

CLASSIFIED LOCATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next one, again a classified location, wherein you are asking for a total of $27,050,400, and the items which comprise this total are 37, which is indicative of a rather new installation, if not totally so.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; NAF No. 3 (AOA) funded construction not in plant value, $40,381,500; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $27,050,400; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $27,050,400; and the estimated future appropriation required, $24,231,000.

Is this a new installation or one which has been in existence?

Captain MCKINNEY. This is a new installation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

CLASSIFIED LOCATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will proceed now with the next item, wherein I find under "Classified locations" additional aviation facilities totaling $5,551,000. Is that correct for your next item, gentlemen?

Captain MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record, you will tell us where this expenditure is to be made and further advise us as to the necessity of it.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been engineered? If so, by whom, when, and what is the cost?

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like the record to show that the committee appreciates the appearance of the gentlemen from the Bureau of Aeronautics and thanks them for the manner in which they answered the interrogations.

Admiral CLARK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order, and we have before us the gentlemen to justify the requests for supply facilities.

Admiral, will you note your name and position for the record, please.

Admiral PARKS. I am Rear Adm. J. D. Parks, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have a statement you desire to present?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, we have a statement of the admiral we desire to present for the record, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to compliment you upon your brevity. Go right ahead and present your statement.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Admiral PARKS. The requested appropriation in this program for "Supply facilities" under the management control of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts totals $9,254,100 for 19 items.

64997—55——15

The program has as its principal objective the correction of deficiencies and the improvement of vital operating conditions.

No new activities are contemplated for establishment. The major portion of the program is for the correction of existing deficiencies which seriously affect supply operations, such as the replacement of deteriorated cold storage at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and warehouses and berthing space at Guam. The correction of deficiencies represents approximately 95 percent of this program.

The remainder of the required appropriation provides family housing at various continental and overseas installations to meet essential housing requirements for military and civilian personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Admiral.

UNITED STATES NAVY FUEL DEPOT, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

We will pick up the first item reflected in the justifications as the United States Navy fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla., wherein you are asking for $15,200 for family housing for 1 junior officer.

I note at this installation the plant value is $3,778,588; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $15,200; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $15,200; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Will you proceed with your justification for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. This item is to provide on-station quarters for the commanding officer and release the only set of quarters which are on the station and which are rental quarters to a key civilian employee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see your unit cost is reflected as $15,200 and that is what you are asking for?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And I presume this item is considered as essential on the same general premise as the others we have considered?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By whom was this project engineered, Captain, and when and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. The estimate was prepared from DOD criteria.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT, NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, naval supply depot, Newport, R. I., wherein you are requesting a total of $1,041,000, and this is composed of three items, rehabilitation of fuel piers; addition to administration building; and provision of sidewalks and street lighting.

I note at this installation the plant value is $23,061,364; funded construction not in the plant value, $5,639,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,041,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,041,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,056,000.

Will you present your justifications for these requirements?

Admiral CLARK. Item 1 is for the rehabilitation of two piers in Newport. They were both built in 1906 and they are so deteriorated that they are unsafe for further use and require complete rehabilitation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you go into an operation of this kind what do you do, take one pier completely out of circulation and handle your traffic on the other pier until you have completed the rehabilitation, and then reverse the operation?

Admiral CLARK. That is what we would do in this case; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice the proposed addition to the administration building is a one-story wood frame addition. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. We are now conducting administration for the supply department in three separated localities. Part is in a naval training center building; part is in a warehouse 3 miles away; and the third part is in another naval training station building. This consolidation, we feel, will amortize the project in less than 10 years through greater efficiency and the requirement of many less letters to be written, many less messengers, and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it will be a more streamlined operation?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

The next item is "Provision of sidewalks and street lighting." This item is proposed to provide sidewalks and street lighting for approximately 1 mile of roads within the depot that are continually used by pedestrians and vehicles. Unless these facilities are provided, pedestrian and vehicular travel will continue to be extremely hazardous with possible loss of military personnel from duty and/or accident claims against the Government.

Captain MCHENRY. Advance planning was performed by the district public works officer, First Naval District.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.," wherein you request a total of $777,000 composed of four items.

I note at this installation the plant value is $68,208,826; funded construction not in the plant value, $12,142,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $777,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $777,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $7,370,000.

I will appreciate it if you would advise us as to the modernization of the cold-stoage building.

Admiral CLARK. The present cold-storage building, sir, is a bottleneck in handling provisions for the fleet units as well as the Shore Establishment in this area. The existing refrigeration facilities are so badly arranged they require night shifts to supply the support required to the fleet. There are inadequate elevators, the assembly-area spaces are too small for the size of the operation, and the office space is so short we actually have to use a truck trailer outside the building.

The next item is "Freight elevators, building A–134." Mezzanine floors, 50 feet by 600 feet are located on each side of this warehouse and provide storage and issue for 30,000 fast moving, small aircraft parts.

This item will provide a heavy duty hydraulic elevator for each mezzanine to replace two temporary hazardous semiportable, light elevators, and eliminate hand operations. Without this facility, the depot will continue to be unable to meet peacetime peak-load requirements.

The next item is "Freight elevators, building A–136."

The same situation exists in this building as in building A–134 just described.

The next item proposes to relocate the existing access road and railroad serving the Cheatham Annex, Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va., so as to pass under the Department of the Interior's Colonial Parkway and fulfill commitments by the Department of the Navy to restore the parkway to its original condition. Unless this item is completed, vehicles and rail traffic entering and leaving the activity will be a serious hazard to public traffic on the Colonial Parkway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, have these projects been engineered and if so by whom, when, and at what cost?

Captain MCHENRY. They have been engineered by Clark & Buhr during the last month at a cost of $2,650.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.," wherein you are requesting a total of $62,000 composed of two items, improvement of electrical system and acquisition of easement for sewer.

I note at this installation the plant value is $49,228,665; funded construction not in the plant value, $3,051,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $62,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $62,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,823,000.

Will you present your justifications for those requirements?

Admiral CLARK. The first item is the improvement of the electrical system. This electrical system was constructed in 1942 and was adequate then but no longer is, because of increased loads. In addition, the original installation has deteriorated, being made of wartime materials, and a major revision is now necessary. The serious deficiencies are, first, bad distribution so that you cannot isolate or segregate any part for repairs; second, corrosion because of the underground installation.

The next item for the purchase of a perpetual easement is required to assure permanent continued disposal of Navy sewage by the municipal system. Unless this permanent easement is acquired, further lengthy negotiations or costly litigation may be necessary to insure continued Government use of the private property which is mandatory for disposal of Government sewage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, will you answer the usual questions about the engineering?

Captain MCHENRY. The engineering was done by Williamson & Regan in the past 6 months, at a cost of $1,630.

Supply Facilities, Overseas

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next items that are in volume III under the title of "Supply Facilities—Overseas."

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands

The first item is the Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands, wherein you request a total of $5,427,000 constituted of 2 items, rehabilitation of docks, and 2 general purpose warehouses.

I note at this installation the plant value is $31,995,883; funded construction not in the plant value, $21,055,400; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $5,427,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $5,427,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $17,178,000.

Will you present your justifications for that requirement, please?

Admiral Clark. The first item is for the rehabilitation of docks. These docks were constructed during World War II by putting sheet piling out in the harbor and filling between it and the land with local sand and there was no cathodic protection of that sheet piling so that now the sand and gravel dock is slowly sinking into the harbor. This will provide a complete rehabilitation so that these docks can be saved before they all slide into the harbor, and the new docks will provide cathodic protection.

Mr. Sheppard. If you did not get this money how long would you have an operational dock left?

Admiral Clark. I think the first step we would try to do would be to patch up to the end of our maintenance money, and if we did not have any more maintenance money it would probably require complete replacement in about 3 years. We could do our complete operation within a year or two but we might be able to use one end of this long dock. It is a long dock.

The next item, for 2 general purpose warehouses, is required to alleviate a deficiency of 214,800 square feet of general storage space based on austere peacetime requirements. The 2 buildings will replace 100 quonset huts which are so deteriorated from age and climate that they are in danger of collapse from typhoons and require excessive manpower and funds to maintain in a watertight condition to protect stored materials from rainstorms. Unless the permanent warehouses are constructed, adequate facilities will not be available for effective and expeditious supply support.

Mr. Sheppard. Was this engineered?

Captain McHenry. It was engineered by the public works officer in the Marianas area at Government expense during the present year.

Naval Supply Depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, Naval Supply Depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, wherein you request a total of $1,318,000 for a cold-storage plant.

I note at this installation the plant value is $5,080,860; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,318,000; the pro-

posed 1956 appropriation, $1,318,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,926,000.

Will you present your justifications for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. The present cold-storage plant consists of old temporary buildings, five in number. They are so old they actually endanger personnel going in, the stored provisions, and require excessive expenditures for maintenance, repairs, and operations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you will put in a 25-ton icemaking plant. What kind of plant will you put in there, York or Arctic, or what?

Captain MCHENRY. I would say that will be developed when the bids are taken.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not know what kind of specifications will be written?

Captain MCHENRY. They will be open requirements and everybody will have a crack at it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who engineered this, Captain?

Captain MCHENRY. The district public works officer, 10th Naval District, at Government expense within the past 6 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice you say "Savings in maintenance and operations will amortize the new structure in approximately 2 years." Will you explain how you arrived at that conclusion?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; I have a breakdown of that.

Admiral PARKS. We have been pouring money into that plant like water to keep it going.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the age of the plant?

Admiral CLARK. It has been there since 1942. We could not get termiteproof lumber at the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is scattered in five buildings?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. These are for all hand operations.

Mr. ANDREWS. What type of construction would you provide under this request?

Admiral PARKS. Concrete.

Mr. ANDREWS. And you presently have wood?

Admiral PARKS. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. I have the figures here. The savings are reflected in a reduction of 34 operating personnel, amounting to $63,100 per year, and reduced maintenance. Maintenance and repairs during the 10 years 1958 to 1968 are estimated to average $7,200, an average saving of $128,800 over the cost of maintaining and repairing the present facilities. The total estimated savings of $191,900 per year would amortize the difference between the cost of the proposed plant and the rehabilitation of the present facilities in approximately 2 years.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, PEARL HARBOR, T. H.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, T. H., wherein you request a total of $270,000 composed of 3 items.

I note at this installation the plant value is $88,154,685; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $270,000; the pro-

posed 1956 appropriation, $270,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $8,664,000.

I wish you would address yourself to the item of land acquisition and give us an explanation of that, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the extinguishment of the present perpetual easement through the Waiawa Gulch area. Actually, the former owners of the property, when they sold us this area, requested and were given a perpetual easement for the workmen who worked on their plantations to go through this area. At that time we were not utilizing this particular area with anything that mattered. Now they tell us that the road they have been using is no longer usable. They want to bring in some more operations into the area and they propose to exercise their easement to go through this property, which will at the present time jeopardize our security. They agreed that if we purchase this easement they would take this money and provide another outlet for these people, and that seems to be an equitable solution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I view your map, the present road is the one right in the center of your operations?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You want to eliminate that hazard and move it down to the broken line indicated as an access road?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Address yourself to the drum reconditioning plant, please. I think it is a good thing to do because I understand you do not do too much good to the drums by shipping them.

Admiral CLARK. That is true. If we rehabilitate them in Hawaii it would save the shipping costs and amortize this item in about 2 years.

The next item proposes to consolidate four separately metered electric power sources into a single metered source from the local private utility, in order to take advantage of a lower rate for the same total power when supplied through a single source. The cost of this item will be amortized in less than 8 years. Unless this facility is provided, unnecessary funds will have to be expended by the Government for the procurement of electric power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the engineering, Captain?

Captain MCHENRY. The engineering was done by the public works officer of the 14th Naval District at Government expense in the past 6 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is quarters, location A, for which you request $84,100. Inasmuch as the justification is classified information, I believe you will answer off the record.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have three classifications, location A, location B, and location C. You have told me about location A. Give me your comments about location B, for which you want the same amount of money, $84,100.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is a different location than the previous one?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now address yourself to location C, where you are requesting $175,700.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. General, do you have a general statement you would like to present to the committee?

General ALLEN. Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed, please.

GENERAL STATEMENT

General ALLEN. The Marine Corps' public works appropriation program for fiscal year 1956 consists of 44 items. These 44 items constitute the urgent requirements for this year to successfully prosecute the mission of the Marine Corps. To achieve this objective, appropriation for 44 items totaling $69,681,300 is requested. $24,617,300 is for facilities within the continental United States, and $45,064,000 for facilities overseas. This program is divided into five broad functional categories, the number of items in each type and the dollar value of each type is as follows:

Seventy-two percent of the program will provide 4 items for training facilities valued at $50,117,000.

Twelve percent of the program will provide 18 items for utilities valued at $8,565,000.

Four percent of the program will provide 8 items for administrative facilities valued at $2,811,000.

Three percent of the program will provide 10 items for supply facilities valued at $2,385,000.

Nine percent of the program will provide 4 items for quarters and recreation valued at $5,803,300.

Facilities will be provided at 10 Marine Corps activities and is summarized as follows:

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, ALBANY, GA.

Eight items valued at $4,869,300 will enable the center to accomplish the scheduled equipment maintenance and will provide the necessary storage both covered and open for that equipment and supplies under procurement. Two recreational facilities are also proposed which have not been previously provided. Necessary utilities are included to support these projects. Included also is the construction of 97 family quarters.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, BARSTOW, CALIF.

Three items valued at $330,000 will provide covered storage which is not now available. An item to acquire 1,082 acres of land to cost

$11,000 is also included to protect the Government's investment in the buildings located there. Appropriation also is requested for 3 items valued at $160,000 to provide a brig, a civilian cafeteria, and a provost marshal's office.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, N. C.

Three items valued at $866,000 will provide necessary utilities and service where a deficiency exists such as fire protection, heating for barracks, and water-treatment facilities. Appropriation also is requested for 4 items valued at $193,000 to provide replacement and improvement of telephone cables, improvement of water distribution system, toilet facilities for BOQ's, and raw-water-well control system.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, PARRIS ISLAND, S. C.

Three items valued at $1,654,000 will replace the present unsatisfactory 50-year-old maintenance shops and provide facilities for orderly reception, interview, and testing of recruits for classification. Appropriation also is requested to correct deficiencies in the steam distribution system.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP PENDLETON, CALIF.

Two items valued at $648,000 will replace unsatisfactory utilities where there is a deficiency such as exists in the telephone system, and six new water wells.

MARINE CORPS CLOTHING DEPOT, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Appropriation is requested for one item valued at $30,000 to provide necessary fire protection.

MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS, QUANTICO, VA.

Eleven items valued at $15,688,700 are required for the Marine Corps schools. Areas for artillery firing will be cleared of brush and trees to permit adequate control of training exercises. Requested also is a new trunk highway to permit egress and ingress to the post proper from United States Route 1 and the training areas. An enlarged water storage and distribution facility is required to overcome unsatisfactory conditions as proven by the last 2 years' droughts, and medical facilities to provide care for personnel in the main area of the post are required. Appropriation also is requested to provide a central camp in the Guadalcanal training area for the basic school to train newly commissioned officers, to provide a school administration building and new maintenance shops. Also requested are additional ammunition storage facilities and 300 sets of family quarters.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

One item valued at $71,000 will provide a shelter for families visiting recruits. Appropriation also is requested for 1 item valued at $49,000 to pave muster areas in the vicinity of mess halls.

MARINE CORPS TRAINING CENTER, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIF.

One item valued at $47,300 is required to provide family quarters for 1 flag and 1 senior officer.

OVERSEAS

Two items valued at $45,064,000 are required to provide billeting, messing, and training facilities to house 1 reinforced Marine division (minus 1 regimental combat team) and provide a water supply system for 1 regimental combat team.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES, CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will proceed with the justifications for the first item, "Marine Corps facilities," and the first project appearing in the request under this item is Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga., where you are asking $4,869,300, and that title is composed of eight supporting requirements.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, ALBANY, GA.

At this installation the plant value is $1,640,014; funded construction not in plant value, $39,546,840; existing unfunded authorization, $440,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,157,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,597,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $5,943,380.

Will you make your presentation relative to the first item of $1,173,000 covered storage.

General ALLEN. That is for covered storage: 1 warehouse, 200 by 1,000 feet, standard concrete building, 200,000 square feet. In order for this depot to fulfill its peacetime mission, an additional 400,000 square feet of covered storage is urgently required. It is proposed by this item to erect one masonry and concrete warehouse providing 200,000 square feet of covered storage which will satisfy 50 percent of the urgent requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it contemplated that the other 50 percent will appear in next year's budget?

General ALLEN. Probably so. We are reanalyzing our warehousing needs as we go along, and we have not been entirely sure that the requirements will be in this next year, depending upon the procurements, whether they will be required next year or the following.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see the requirement for these facilities represents a total of 230,000 square feet with a unit cost of $5.10 per foot; is that correct?

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain McHenry, who engineered this requirement, when and how much?

Captain MCHENRY. It was engineered by Dunwody, MacEwen, Ferguson, Hall & Greiner Associates. It was in the past 6 months; and I will furnish the figures for the record. The cost was $1,625.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice under family housing that you are asking for 97 units, company grade units at a cost of $15,200, and enlisted at $12,850. I presume that is compatible with the geographical area cost factor; is that correct?

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

General ALLEN. The next project is for utilities, services and site development in the amount of $855,000. These utilities are required to provide necessary water, electricity, and sewer disposal to the new construction being erected at this depot this fiscal year. The next item is item 3, paved open storage and utility building, in the amount of $441,000. This item provides for 3,025,000 square feet of paved open storage and 2 utility buildings at 4,000 square feet each, containing toilet facilities, office space and space for storage of materials handling equipment. This project provides 50 percent of the remaining requirement for open storage. Item No. 4, recreational facilities, in the amount of $362,000 is urgently required for a post exchange, and an all-purpose gym for use by the 1,616 officers stationed at Albany. The only recreation facilities now available is a service club for the enlisted personnel. This item is extremely important to the morale of the personnel. The next item is a cold-storage building, valued at $152,000 and is required to provide for bulk cold-stoarge space for perishable foods, biologicals and other items which must be stored at low temperatures. The next item provides for 6 drainage ditch crossings valued at $174,000 which are necessary for access to available land for storage area. Without these crossings it is impractical to make full utilization of existing storage areas. The last item, item No. 7, provides for the completion of the repair annex of 53,000 square feet to the central repair shop for a sanding and cleaning shop, battery shop, plating shop and tire and wheel shop, valued at $440,000. These facilities form an integral part of the repair activities for the supply center and the center cannot perform the work assigned to it without this annex.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, BARSTOW, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif., wherein you are requesting $501,000. At this installation the plant value is $29,347,124; funded construction not in plant value, $1,008,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $501,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $501,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $940,000. This is made up of seven items, one which is land acquisition at Daggett. Tell me of your need for this land, General, and how much are you going to pay for it per acre?

General ALLEN. One thousand and eighty-two acres are in this parcel on which Daggett area is located. It is set at $11,000 or approximately $10 an acre. We are holding that now under lease and our desire to acquire this land is to protect the investment we have there. That investment is something in excess of $400,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where does that land lie—north or east—with respect to the present plant?

General ALLEN. It is east of the Nebo main plant, about 10 miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is where the airstrip is?

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How far is it from the airstrip?

General ALLEN. It is at the airstrip.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A part of it?

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you are asking for a brig, at Barstow. Why do you need a brig at Barstow?

General ALLEN. There are very few calcitrants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There certainly could be no bad Marines out there?

General ALLEN. This project will provide the minimum requirement of an 18-man brig at Nebo, estimated to cost $85,000. The present facility was designed for a normal capacity of 10 prisoners and is now substandard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the size of the storage building you are going to put in at Nebo?

General ALLEN. Those are two 40- by 200-foot Butler-type buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Dry storage?

General ALLEN. I was referring to item 6.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was looking at item No. 3, which has to do with cold storage.

General ALLEN. That is located at Nebo and valued at $240,000 and it is urgently required to replace existing makeshift facilities which do not meet present normal requirements. There is a serious deficiency in the existing facilities for storage of sufficient quantities of perishable items to realize the advantage of minimum wholesale prices and for safe preservation of foodstuffs. The estimated annual savings from volume buying amounts to approximately $15,000. The next item, item No. 4, addition to building 129 at Nebo, valued at $39,000, is required to replace the present temporary provost marshal's office, which is outside the main troop and administrative area at Nebo, has poor parking facilities and is hard for visitors to locate. Only with this item can a provost marshal properly exercise control over the security force. The next item is for a storage building, lot 16, at Nebo, estimated cost is $32,000 and it is required to eliminate the expensive replacement of canvas over "On-vehicle material" stored in the open. This material should be stored inside to reduce the loss of deterioration of "On vehicles maintenance" equipment. Item 6 provides for two 40 by 200-foot butler type storage buildings, costing $58,000 and is urgently required for storage of supplies on hand. Lack of this facility will require storage of certain supplies in the open and exposure to the elements causing serious deterioration and loss to the Government. The last item is for civilian cafeteria at Yermo, estimated to cost $36,000 and is required to provide adequate cafeteria facilities for serving hot meals to the 300 civilians employed in that area. There are no such facilities available now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Looking over this request, General, the total requirement as compared with the previous one—and incidentally, some of those that follow—it does not unbalance your expenditures at Barstow; does it?

General ALLEN. The program that we have underway requires, and the one that we are working on is a requirement at Barstow for a maintenance shop. As you probably recall, the maintenance facilities are in three warehouses. We have the Albany repair shop from which we will pull the mistakes, and we will come in probably in 1957 for a large shop at Barstow.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, "Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.," where you are making a request for $1,059,000. The plant value is $88,116,979; funded construction not in plant value, $9,674,530; existing unfunded authorization, none; the priposed 1956 authorization, $1,059,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,059,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $98,590,000. This is composed of seven items, the first of which is for the "Fire department facilities," and is $204,000. Please explain this requirement.

General Allen. This item is urgently required to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the base in protecting personnel and property. It is vital that a firehouse be built at Midway Park and at Camp Geiger. Fire-fighting equipment is now stored at these locations in makeshift shacks and in the open where it deteriorates rapidly and is unreliable when starting, therefore endangering life and Government property.

Mr. Sheppard. Now let us take up the "Water-treatment facilities," item No. 2, for which you are asking $360,000?

General Allen. That is for water-treatment facilities at Montford Point and Onslow Beach. It includes a 750,000-gallon softening plant, 400,000-gallon reservoir, and raw-water collection system.

And at the Onslow Beach plant the building includes a 250,000-gallon softening plant and reservoir and raw-water collection system.

This item is required to reduce the hardness and iron content of the existing potable water supply system. The estimated monetary loss per year is $34,000 due to loss of heat from scale in hot-water pipes increasing plumbing repairs. Unless this item is provided the excessive monetary loss and inefficient water-treatment facilities will continue to hamper base operations.

Mr. Sheppard. I notice that the estimated future appropriation, while it is not a part of this immediate cost, nevertheless, it is reflected as being $98,590,000 which indicates a considerable expansion in the next few years.

General Allen. Mr. Chairman, that includes a large area. At one time it was being considered as a two-division area, and the large "Family quarters" item of $55 million, and that complete item is being reviewed at the present time. I am not sure that the item will remain at $98 million.

Mr. Sheppard. Captain, what are the engineering features of this project, and of the previous one, which I did not inquire about, I believe——

Captain McHenry. No, you did not.

Mr. Sheppard. All right, will you discuss the previous one first?

Captain McHenry. Yes. The engineering for the two sets of fire department facilities was done by the public works officer at Camp Lejeune at Government expense during the past year.

Mr. Sheppard. And then the next one we have just touched upon.

Captain McHenry. This project was engineered also by the public works officer at Camp Lejeune at Government expense, during the past year.

General Allen. Item 3, heating facilities for 90 barracks, costing $302,000 will replace existing oil fired space heaters with steam heat

units tied into existing steam mains adjacent to the barracks. This work is located at Camp Geiger, a portion of Camp Lejeune. It is required to eliminate a serious fire hazard, reduce excessive maintenance cost, and provide proper, uniform heat for the health and well-being of the persons occupying these barracks. The next project, item 4, is for replacement of a telephone cable at Camp Lejeune costing $70,000 and will replace a buried cable from Midway Park exchange to the cable plant located at the Hadnot Point exchange. The present cable has been seriously damaged by electrolytic action of the soil on the lead sheath. This cable was buried in 1942 without any protective coating due to the exigencies of the war. Item No. 5, which is a project for improvement of water distribution system, costing $55,000, is required for the installation of altitude valves on 5 steel elevated water tanks serving the Hadnot Point distribution system and will also provide extension of various water mains and installation of fire hydrants at Hadnot Point, Paradise Point, and Courthouse Bay. This item is urgently required to provide fire protection in these areas. Item 6 is a project to provide toilet facilities in the bachelor officers' quarters at Montford Point, estimated to cost $33,000 and will provide toilet facilities for 5 small existing bachelor officers' quarters, which were converted from barracks buildings. There are normally nine officers assigned to each set of quarters. None of these buildings now contain toilet facilities. The last item, item, No. 7, is required to provide a raw water well control system, costing $35,000 and will install a dual frequency generator centrally located to provide code signals controlled from the water treatment plant to activate well motor starters and to control equipment for the operation of 30 wells in the Hadnot Point raw water supply system.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, Marine Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., for which you are asking $1,654,000 and it is made up of improvements and alterations to the steam distribution system; classification building, and shops for the maintenance division.

At this installation the plant value is $24,563,300; funded construction not in plant value, $1,856,045; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,654,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,654,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $15,071,000.

Will you present the justification, please, for this request, General?

General Allen. Item No. 1, "Improvements and alterations, to steam distribution system." This is required to correct the present steam deficiencies, utilize excess low-pressure steam, and provide proposed new construction projects with steam. The estimated annual savings that can be realized by this item will amount to $80,000. If it is not provided, it will be necessary to continue using the booster station and pumps to furnish sufficient steam to the battalion messhalls and lavatories in the west area, and the operation of the coal-fired, steam-heating plant in the Women Marines' area.

This is a consolidation program as well as new construction, and estimated to cost $890,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, what is the engineering proposition on this project, please?

Captain MCHENRY. The project was advance planned by J. E. Sirrine of Greenville, S. C., within the past 6 months, at a price which I will furnish for the record. (The cost was $2,700.)

General ALLEN. Item 2, at Parris Island, is a project for a classification building, estimated to cost $140,000, and is urgently required for a permanent classification building to properly and efficiently process and test recruits. During the period, June 30, 1953, and June 30, 1954, over 50,000 recruits were processed. It is now necessary to use an existing building originally designed as a dental prosthetic laboratory, which is a poor substitute for classification purposes. The remaining item, item 3, is a project for maintenance building, costing $624,000, and is required to replace widely scattered deteriorated buildings throughout the old congested industrial area. The division of facilities and cramped space produces poor workmanship and excessive operational costs.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP PENDLETON, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are no further questions, we will pick up the next item, the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., wherein the total request is for $648,000. This is made necessary by telephone entrance cable and De Luz exchange in the amount of $388,000 and an additional water supply item of $260,000, and all of the rest is crossed out.

General ALLEN. That is correct.

At this installation the plant value is $78,623,085; funded construction not in plant value, $24,171,800; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $648,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $648,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $49,369,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you give us the justifications for the telephone entrance cable and exchange, General?

General ALLEN. This item will correct a serious deficiency in telephone service. It is urgently required for base operations to increase the capacity of the existing telephone entrance cable of 253 pairs by 202 pairs. The recently constructed title VIII De Luz Homes housing is currently without adequate telephone service. The local telephone company is not willing to provide this service which is necessary for fire, police, and emergency service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before we go into the next item, I want to inquire into the items that are deleted, what happened; was this action by the Bureau of the Budget, or the Secretary of Defense, or whom?

General ALLEN. This is an Armed Services Committee cut.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Armed Services Committee?

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On what premise?

General ALLEN. On the premise that the adjudication of the water in the Santa Margarita River had not been resolved, and as a result of the fact that adjudication has not been resolved with the permanent supply of water that may be questioned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, tell me about the water wells at the field training camps and how many of them are involved?

General ALLEN. Six.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Six. Where are you going to put them, geographically speaking?

General ALLEN. Those are placed in accordance with the plan as provided by the USGS to adequately pump all parts of the subterranean basin, so as not to draw from any one area. Those wells are located as follows: two in the upper basin and one in the middle basin of the Santa Margarita River, and one in each of the three watersheds—San Onofre, Las Pulgas, and Horno basins.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are we going to get ourselves into any legal difficulty by sinking these wells?

General ALLEN. No, I do not believe so; as these are all drawing on water supply that is within the boundary of Camp Pendleton.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the legal situation had been clear in the first place, and you had received an appropriation to put the dam in, these water wells would not have been necessary?

General ALLEN. Yes; they would have been.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They would have? Why?

General ALLEN. As is desirable, in order to maintain the underground static level of water, as near level as possible and not overdraw on any one area, which, if overdrawn, there is a tendency for salt water intrusion.

Colonel ROBERTSON. The most economical way to store water, particularly in this area, is underground, with the dam to recharge the underground basins, thus these wells would have been necessary anyway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If I remember the thing correctly at the time it was proposed, I was definitely under the impression that what we wanted to do was to conserve the runoff by holding the water behind the dam, as it were.

Colonel ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And then use the head that would be built there for distribution purposes, and to the degree necessary to put in any further wells that may be needed.

Colonel ROBERTSON. That is true as to the originally proposed dam; but further study and better advice has indicated that a dam of that size would be unwise and that the best use of the stream would be a smaller dam and the use of this already existing storage basin underground.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you consider is the amount of water that you are losing by the runoff, water that you are not catching by any means at all?

Colonel ROBERTSON. That is a rather hard question to answer. So far as the last 10 years is concerned, it has been practically nil, with one exception. In most of the years, for the past 10, there has been practically no runoff to the sea. One year, I think it was something in the neighborhood of 40,000 acre-feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then let me ask the question this way: Is there a possibility that you are giving the answer from the surface standpoint, but not the loss of the so-called runoff, secondary or under-surface water?

Colonel ROBERTSON. We believe that the subsurface loss is negligible, and except for the reuse of sewage effluent at the lower part of the basin to prevent salt water intrusion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the pending litigation between the water interests?

Colonel ROBERTSON. An effort was made to try two defendants' cases separately, the Fallbrook Public Utility District and the Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co. There followed a series of events whereby Fallbrook did not come to trial but the Santa Margarita Water Co. did come to trial and was tried, and the State of California intervened, and that case also went to trial. The United States was successful in obtaining judgment in the district court against both defendants. That matter was appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, argument was had last November, and final decision has not been handed down yet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last November. Almost a year.

Colonel ROBERTSON. Yes.

The Fallbrook and other cases have not come to trial because of the fact the district court felt there were many principles of law and matters of proceeding that were to be ruled on by the circuit court, and it was felt that it would be a waste of time for him to proceed to trial against the other two defendants until the matter in appeal was decided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just what do the deletions mean in your operation requirements; how much will these deletions impair your overall program?

General ALLEN. This is only one year that this has happened. I believe the 1952 presentation was the first that was deleted more drastically as a result of the pending litigation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At that time, however, the reduction of the appropriation was predicated on the dam, and did not have to do with the other operations such as administration and so forth; in other words, it was left with the dam deleted.

General ALLEN. There was an 11,000-man camp expansion program in the same year that the dam was deleted from the program also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does it mean that you are going to have to transfer the activities of the Marine Corps at Camp Pendleton to some other geographical area because of your inability to get the items provided for and set forth here under the deletions?

General ALLEN. No, unless this continues, as the facilities that we are using are wartime facilities and are gradually falling apart; as an example some of the barracks, previously used, we have had to eliminate because of excessive deterioration; that is a part of the program. We can get along as we are with the greatly diminishing returns, from the investment that we have there, as well as the poor living conditions for these people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not find here an increase under your maintenance requirements. Does that appear some other place?

General ALLEN. That shows up in the annual operation program.

Captain MCHENRY. Appropriation for troops and facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Obviously you would have these additional billets because at the time when your regular budget came up, these deletions would not have been affected.

General ALLEN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So by the deletion of these buildings, your maintenance program will obviously be affected in the cost requirements?

General ALLEN. On the maintenance program, they will be increased.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And there is no provision made for that?

General ALLEN. That historically is handled as in the past; and even though we receive no funds in this year, any savings in maintenance, it is quite possible, would not be accomplished until the fiscal year 1957, because it will take approximately that long to get the new facilities in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions on this item? If not, Captain, will you give us the facts regarding the engineering factors, please?

Captain MCHENRY. The engineering for the telephone entrance cable was done by the district public-works officer of the 11th Naval District during the past 6 months, at Government expense.

The water-well planning was by a combination of the district public-works officer of the 11th Naval District and the United States Geological Survey at Government expense, within the past 6 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was there any advance engineering done by contract for the base headquarters and the administration building, troop, storage station, depot, additional heating system, maintenance facilities, including base channel, family housing, et cetera?

Captain MCHENRY. I do not have that information but I will furnish it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would get it and supply it for the record. I would like to know how much of the advanced program has been deleted.

Captain MCHENRY. Very well.

(The information requested follows:)

Only two proposed projects in the 1956 program for Camp Pendleton were advance planned by contract A. and E. These were Fuel Storage Depot addition originally proposed in amount of $366,000 but later curtailed to $50,000, and the addition to heating system $108,000. These two studies were accomplished by M. A. Nishkian Co., Long Beach, Calif., at a combined cost of $4,420. All other projects were advance planned by district public works officer, 11th Naval District at Government expense.

MARINE CORPS CLOTHING DEPOT, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we will take up the next item which reflects the Marine Corps Clothing Depot, Philadelphia, Pa., wherein you are asking for fire-protection facilities in the amount of $30,000. At this installation the plant value is $13,292,399; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $30,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $30,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $402,000. What is your deficiency in your fire-protection system; is that in your mechanical devices, or what?

General ALLEN. It is lack of mechanical devices; and it is an old system under which we are drawing water and paying rent to an adjacent owner for this water supply. This will give us a complete system on which we can operate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if you get this appropriation, you will be self-contained with your water-supply equipment?

General ALLEN. Yes. This item is urgently required to correct deficiencies in the existing fire-protection system which, as I say, is

dependent upon an adjacent commercial establishment for its water supply. According to information received from insurance carriers, the pump located on the adjacent property is incapable of furnishing an adequate supply of water for fire-protection purposes and commercial operational purposes. If this project is not approved this annex, valued at $443,353.90 will continue to have inadequate fire protection.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.

Mr. Sheppard. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up the next item, "Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.," wherein you are asking for $15,613,700, and the requirement is made up of 10 subsidiary requirements. I note at this installation the plant value is $43,503,173; funded construction not in plant value, $4,984,300; existing unfunded authorization, $2,210,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $9,357,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $11,492,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $53,781,000. Will you please present your justification for the first item, trunk highway, wherein you are requesting $1,900,000.

General Allen. This will provide a highway from the Marine Corps schools area to the field-training area. It will eliminate existing hazardous conditions resulting from inadequacies and physical conditions involved in the route which now has to be used for travel from the Marine Corps Schools to the Guadalcanal training area.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the total amount of land acquisition required?

Captain McHenry. May I furnish that information?

General Allen. Yes.

Captain McHenry. This is to obtain an easement for a right-of-way, from the State of Virginia.

Mr. Sheppard. I notice the reflected cost is nominal.

Captain McHenry. Yes.

Mr. Sheppard. I notice that the Senate has reduced the cost of the trunk highway by $500,000.

General Allen. Yes.

Mr. Sheppard. Is that the same item that we are presently addressing ourselves to?

General Allen. That is the same item.

Mr. Sheppard. Does your justification contain an excess of $500,000 reflected as a cost factor there? The item I am referring to, General, is easement for right-of-way and overpass.

General Allen. Yes.

Mr. Sheppard. What I mean is when the presentation was made, did you people make the presentation before the Senate committee?

General Allen. Yes.

Mr. Sheppard. Did you set any figure for the easement, right-of-way, and overpass, do you have any figures on that, Captain?

Captain McHenry. Mr. Chairman, I have a comment here on the project that it was originally submitted for 4 lanes, and 4 quadrants of a cloverleaf intersection, but it has thus far been reduced by the reviewing authority to a 2-lane highway with 2 quadrants of a cloverleaf, and that is the amount cut by $500,000.

Mr. Sheppard. What was the total amount that was presented at that time?

Colonel ROBERTSON. $1,900,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see. And they cut $500,000?

General ALLEN. From the $1.9 million; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you present the justification for the next item, enlarged water storage and distribution system, wherein the request is $1,100,000?

General ALLEN. The present water supply has proven inadequate for the station's needs. During the summer months, it has been necessary to close field training camps due to insufficient water. This will provide a reservoir by construction of a dam on Beaver Dam Run, and a distribution system connecting to existing mains which will meet the current requirements for additional water.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have three items, land, buildings, and acquisition cost—item 3, involving 1.798 acres, with a unit cost of $556.

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that procurable or will you have to go through condemnation proceedings to get it?

General ALLEN. We have an option to buy that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering status of this project, Captain?

Captain MCHENRY. Item 1, "Trunk highway," was engineered by Perrow & Brockenbrough of Richmond, Va., during the past 6 months at a price of $11,372.

Item No. 2 was engineered by Whitman, Requardt & Associates of Baltimore, Md., during the past 6 months, at a price of $9,000.

Item No. 3, the estimate for the land, was prepared by the public works officer at the Marine Corps schools at Quantico, Va., at Government expense.

General ALLEN. The next item at the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va., is item No. 4, "Improvements to training facilities," costing $653,000. This project will clear 2,844 acres of land and provide 3 mess areas to serve 600 to 900 personnel. This project is urgently required to provide an area for tactical problems for officers undergoing basic training and is necessary to provide additional problem sites. An officer undergoing basic training spends approximately 60 percent of his time in the field undergoing training. All officers coming into the Marine Corps receive training at the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, and this training area is urgently required to provide as much realistic combat type training as possible.

The next item, item 5, provides for ammunition storage facilities, estimated to cost $199,000 and will provide 1 triple-section concrete magazine, 3 flat-roof concrete magazines, 2 prefabricated metal magazines, and 1 covered concrete platform. This project will provide proper storage for ammunition and will prevent deterioration of ammunition.

The next item is a project for the Guadalcanal area central camp, estimated to cost $4,400,000 and provide bachelor officers' quarters, bachelor officers' mess, an academic building, heating plant, and necessary utilities and services. This project is urgently required to provide basic school facilities for training newly commissioned Marine Corps officers in their duties and responsibilities. There are no adequate facilities now available to provide living facilities for these newly commissioned officers at their training area.

The next item is item No. 7, medical facility, costing $1,043,000 and is urgently required to replace the existing dispensary which is a temporary building, built in 1940. This existing building is a fire hazard and is functionally unfit for medical use. If this project is not provided, the health of the command will be continually jeopardized by the use of unfit facilities. Item 8 is a project for 2 storehouses, estimated to cost $42,000 and will provide 8,000 square feet of covered storage to protect the supplies and materials which must be handled by Engineer Maintenance Supply Section and the Reclamation and Salvage Section. The next item, item 9, will provide for post maintenance shops and administration building, costing $2,135,000, and is urgently required to replace 21 miscellaneous shop buildings, located throughout the post. The existing maintenance facilities at the Marine Corps Schools are totally inadequate. This project also provides for an administration building at the Marine Corps Schools. At present administration of the Marine Corps Schools is accomplished in a barracks building which is urgently needed for its intended purpose. The next item, item 10, is required to provide family housing, costing $4,121,700 and will provide 3 field grade officers' quarters at $20,250 each, and 104 junior officers' quarters at $15,200 each, and 193 enlisted men's quarters at $12,850 each. This project is urgently required to provide needed family housing for married officers and qualified enlisted personnel at this station to relieve the current existing shortage.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. We will take up the next item, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif., wherein you are requesting $120,000, which is made up of a reception center at Camp Matthews, for $71,000, and paving, $49,000.

The plant value is $16,036,570; funded construction not in plant value, $582,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $120,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $120,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,370,000.

Will you present the justifications, please?

General Allen. Project, item 1, for the reception center, Camp Matthews, is for a one-story building, 2,740 square feet and includes site clearing and collateral equipment. This is a requirement at Camp Matthews, an unpopulated area, 14 miles from metropolitan San Diego, and the only facilities available for families visiting recruits consist of pyramidal tents with no adequate sanitary facilities. The proposed building will accommodate 160 visitors at the camp each weekend. If not corrected, the existing condition will result in poor public relations and publicity for the Marine Corps as a whole. The morale of the recruits is lowered considerably when their families visit them and find the existing conditions so deplorable.

The paving item is urgently required to eliminate an unsanitary condition generated by continual clouds of dust being blown into the messhalls by the prevailing winds during the dry season and mud being carried in during inclement weather. If this is not approved, the existing unsanitary condition will continue to exist to the detriment of the health and morale of the personnel.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the engineering situation at this project, please?

Captain McHENRY. The project was advance-planned by the district public works officer of the 11th Naval District, at Government expense, within the past 6 months.

MARINE CORPS TRAINING CENTER, TWENTY-NINE PALMS, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, Calif., family housing for general officer and senior officer, field grade, involving a total request of $47,300.

General ALLEN. That is for 2-family quarters, for general officer and 1 field officer, senior officer quarters. There are no quarters of that size within the area, and it is designed to meet the Defense Department criteria for the senior officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that Twenty-Nine Palms has a little more glowing future than Barstow. It is estimated in the future, of course, that there will be a $4,034,900 expansion.

We will pick up the next item, reflected in volume 3, classified, reflected as Fleet Marine Corps facilities wherein you are requesting $45 million.

At this installation there is no plant value; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $45 million; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $45 million; and the estimated future appropriation required, none. I notice that the expenditures that I referred to a moment ago are in the classified category, General——

General ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will make a presentation to the committee, off the record, as to the location and the requirements and the total amount requested.

(Off the record discussion.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This request is made necessary under your present expansion program; is that correct?

(Off the record presentation.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have another item, just referred to, also classified, in the amount of $64,000. At this installation there is no plant value; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $64,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $64,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,083,000.

Will you supply us with that presentation, please?

(Off the record discussion.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to thank you, General, for your appearance and your responses to our interrogatories.

General ALLEN. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1955.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES—CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order.

I see we have with us this morning Admiral Withington.

Have you a prepared statement you wish to make at this time?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.
Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. We will not interrupt you.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF CHIEF OF BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

Admiral WITHINGTON. Gentlemen, the objective of the Bureau of Ordnance public works program is to provide the facilities necessary to support the Bureau's mission. The facilities in this program are required to prosecute successfully an integrated program of research, design, development, manufacture, storage, distribution, and issue of ordnance and ammunition to the fleet and for certain requirements of the Army and Air Force.

To achieve this objective, new appropriation totaling $21,713,000 is requested: $15,444,000 for facilities in this country and $6,269,000 for facilities overseas including the provision of a small amount of military family housing at 2 classified locations. This program is divided into six broad functional types. The number of projects in each type, the dollar value of each type, and the percentage comparison of this cost to the total are as follows:

Type of project	Number of projects	Cost	Percent of total cost
Ammunition storage	3	$4,871,000	23.43
Research and development	5	4,748,000	21.87
Ammunition production and renovation	8	3,860,000	17.78
Explosive safety	4	2,051,000	9.45
Self-liquidating in less than 10 years	4	5,081,000	23.40
Miscellaneous to improve morale or comply with public laws	6	1,102,000	5.07
Total	30	21,713,000	100.00

The facilities under each type are as follows:

A. Ammunition storage (continental):	
Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif., ammunition storage and test facility	$188,000
Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., ammunition storage and test facility	113,000
Ammunition storage (overseas): Location classified, ammunition storage facilities	4,570,000
Subtotal	4,871,000
B. Research and development (continental):	
Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va., aviation ordnance research and development facilities	644,000
Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., steam ejectors and barometric condensers	1,111,000
Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md., experimental propellant processing facilities	647,000
Naval underwater ordnance station, Newport, R. I., torpedo launching devices test facility	370,000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md., modernize aeroballistics facilities	1,976,000
Subtotal	4,748,000

C. Ammunition production and renovation (continental):	
Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev., develop water supply system	$504,000
Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md., improve potable water system	460,000
Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Wash., quality evaluation laboratory	376,000
Naval ordnance plant, Louisville, Ky., ordnance drawing storage, reproduction and revision facility	927,000
Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif., X-ray housing facility	241,000
Naval ammunition depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va., central steam plant	420,000
Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Ark., barricaded transfer depot	765,000
Ammunition production and renovation (overseas): Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H., rocket testing facility	167,000
Subtotal	3,860,000
D. Explosive safety (continental):	
Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif., ammunition renovation facility	326,000
Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev., complete barricades loading docks	760,000
Explosive safety (overseas):	
Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.:	
Barricaded classification yard, West Loch	515,000
Barricaded sidings, Lualualei	450,000
Subtotal	2,051,000
E. Self-liquidating in less than 10 years (continental):	
Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C., ammunition renovation facility	193,000
Naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J., refrigerated mine battery storage building	59,000
Naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga., inert manufacturing building	3,800,000
Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif., improve waterfront facilities	1,029,000
Subtotal	5,081,000
F. Miscellaneous to improve morale or comply with public laws (continental):	
Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev., low-cost housing community improvements	160,000
Naval ordnance test station, China Lake, Calif., all faith chapel	375,000
Miscellaneous to improve morale or comply with public laws (overseas):	
Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H., sewage disposal plant	250,000
Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan, subsistence and barracks facilities	66,000
Location classified:	
Family housing, 1 senior officer, 1 junior officer, 8 enlisted men	138,000
Family housing, 1 senior officer, 1 junior officer, 6 enlisted men	113,000
Subtotal	1,102,000
Grand total	21,713,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions, gentlement, pertaining to the statement?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen. We will then go into the breakdown of the justifications for the total of $21 million-plus.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, CHARLESTON, S. C.

We will pick up the first item, "Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.," $193,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $6,229,039; funded construction not in the plant value, $2,561,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $193,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $193,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $493,000.

Present your justification requirement.

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, the Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C., now receives, stores, issues, and renovates, except for modification, all types of ammunition.

This project is to permit us to renovate ammunition at this depot and thereby save the transportation costs which now accrue by shipping this ammunition to an inland depot.

We have a big backlog there because the inland depots are fully occupied and we feel that we can amortize the cost of this facility in about 2 years.

It will require only six additional people to run the facility, and it will not require a reduction in people in any of the other depots because they are fully occupied now, and still a backlog is accumulating in Charleston.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under item 1, section B, under "Turnout," what do you mean by that? Is it a deadhead switch?

Admiral CLARK. It is a single switch.

Mr. SHEPPARD. An interconnecting switch?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are sometimes called deadenders in the justifications. Admiral Perry, what is the status of the engineering features connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. The advance planning for this project, Mr. Chairman, was performed by the district public works officer of the 6th Naval District.

As a consequence the charge for the advance planning was just set up against the operating expenses of the office.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice you have an estimated future appropriations requirement of $493,000. Does it take that much in addition to the $193,000 to bring this station up to date?

Admiral CLARK. That is future after this is completed, sir. I have a list of the probable projects which we will submit next year if you care to go into it.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I have no questions.

NAVAL AVIATION ORDNANCE TEST STATION, CHINCOTEAGUE, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the naval aviation ordnance test station at Chincoteague, Va.

You are asking for $644,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $2,511,799; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $644,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $644,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $3,009,000.

Will you proceed with your justification, gentlemen?

Admiral CLARK. This first item, sir, under "Aviation ordnance research and development facilities," is for gun-test facilities. This is to conduct development and operational tests of aircraft guns in the plane and on the ground where a full series of tests can be run without taking off into the air and under controlled conditions.

The contractors will work right with the Navy in working out the bugs in new materials, and we will save gas, time, and people by being able to do it in one place.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And money will be saved?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is an economic approach to the problem with which you have to deal, anyway. Is that true?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

The second item is for controlled temperature and firing bay wherein we can operate in temperature ranges from minus 100 degrees Fahrenheit to plus 170 degrees Fahrenheit, and test the fire control and guns under temperature and altitude conditions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering status pertaining to this project, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $1,600.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have stricken from your justifications the following language:

> And shop facilities for on-site modification of weapons and components.

What was the reason for that elimination? Isn't that necessary to the project and its successful operation?

Captain LAIRD. It was deleted for approximately the reason you gave, sir. We have also reconsidered it again for next year's program, and the Bureau of Ordnance at the present time has decided not to ask for it in the 1957 program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While it is deleted from your justifications, insofar as the language is concerned, I do not see where it is deleted from the cost.

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir. The original cost was $779,000, I believe, and the cost was deleted and it was brought down to $644,000, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is there any relationship in the location of this installation to Norfolk? It is near Norfolk, is it not?

Admiral CLARK. It has the same relationship to Norfolk as far as this station goes as it does any other air facility. In other words, all

types of planes and guns will be tested at the station. It just happens to be near Norfolk.

There are other functions performed at Chincoteague which are hooked in directly with the operations at Norfolk.

We are asking for room for field carrier landing practice at Chincoteague, but this ordnance facility will service the whole United States so far as ordnance testing is concerned.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is this parimarily a research and development and testing evaluation installation?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And for that reason you require a large parcel of land. I notice the total land area owned is 4,436 acres and in addition, you lease 3,182.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. That land includes some outlying targets, in marshy lands and places such as that.

In other words, we have some target and restricted areas near Chincoteague under command of Chincoteague, but——

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is it more practical to lease this land rather than to purchase it?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, that land is on Wallop's Island and it is State owned. Because the lease is for only $380 a year for the entire parcel of land it is certainly much more economical to lease it than it would be to acquire it in fee.

NAVAL PROVING GROUND, DAHLGREN, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will skip the next item because it has been stricken from the justifications, and I assume that is the result of action by the Armed Services Legislative Committee.

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. That is not yet finished business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va., which I find stricken from the justification.

What was the reason for its being stricken?

Admiral CLARK. I believe it should not have been stricken, sir. It does appear in the Senate report. It is approved by the Senate, and the Congress as a whole has not acted on it as yet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was it stricken legislatively?

Admiral CLARK. It was stricken by the House Armed Services Committee with the remark by the chairman that should the Senate put it back in he would reconsider it.

If I may go off the record?

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it your request at this time that this committee consider the naval proving ground at Dahlgren, Va., land acquisition amounting to $200,000?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. Gentlemen, we will void the draw-through and I will ask you to make your presentation for the land acquistion at the naval proving ground at Dahlgren, Va., in the amount of $200,000.

We also find a deficiency in the Senate report. It is not listed there.

I note at this installation the plant value is $18,776,012; funded construction not in the plant value, $218,000; existing unfunded authorization, $1,571,600; the proposed 1956 authorization, $200,000;

the proposed 1956 appropriation, $200,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $6,747,000.

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is for the acquisition of 850 acres of land adjacent to our naval proving grounds at Dahlgren in order to give safety distance.

We have the responsibility of production proving two types of rockets at the moment—a 2¾-inch rocket and a 5-inch rocket.

We are doing it for both the Navy and the Air Force.

Some years ago we requested and obtained authority and funds to install the rocket launcher, and at the same time we requested authority and funds for the land for which we are asking today.

At that time we were permitted to get the rocket launcher through facilities money. But when they considered the land we were told by the Senate and House Armed Services Committee that they considered the land should come in the public works program.

We therefore addressed letters to the two committees, Senate and House, requesting this land in the public works program, and we got a reply from the House that they had no objection to our acquisition of this land.

Senator Russell did not reply in writing, but gave the apparently oral assurance from his office that they knew of no objection, so we went ahead and built the rocket launcher.

Last year we came up and asked for the land. It was approved in the House Armed Services Committee, disapproved in the Senate.

This year it stands deleted from the report of the House Armed Services Committee and approved in the Senate Armed Services Committee, and as of this moment there has been no conference so far as I know on the subject.

This land is owned by one man who lives in Nebraska and spends his summers there.

The Bureau of Ordnance does not feel it is safe to fire these rockets in the close proximity of this man's land because of the possibility that a stray may land and kill somebody. Also we do not want to lease the land because it might be filled with duds which might or might not be found and somebody plowing 20 years from now might get his head blown off in case it reverts to the owner.

That is the present status of this project, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have already procured the rocket launcher?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is ready for installation?

Admiral CLARK. It is installed, minus the rails.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Partially completed so far as installation is concerned?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You consider it a pertinent part of the Dahlgren operation. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

This is the land we will acquire, sir, the dark portion.

The red spot on the map is the man's house.

We own the green, and our launcher is shown to the left where Captain Laird is pointing.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you always shoot in the same direction over the water?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. We carefully control our shooting so if anybody is coming up or down the river they have all kinds of warning. They will not shoot if there is any traffic.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In fact you keep patrol boats out there?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What did you say was the total amount of acreage involved?

Admiral CLARK. 850, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Asking $200,000 for it.

Is there willingness on the part of the owner to dispose of the land at the figure you have indicated?

Admiral CLARK. There is a lack of willingness on his part to dispose of it for any amount of money so far as I know, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Apparently you will have to go into condemnation proceedings to get the property. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. I believe we would; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is your intention to procure the entire amount of acreage blacked out on the map?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Last year the only objection voiced was from this one gentlemen. I don't know whether the other four people have voiced objection or acquiescence.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, insofar as the project is concerned this has been appraised and I assume there has been no engineering technique required on a project of this character?

Admiral PERRY. No engineering at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Here again I cannot help but raise the question. If this authorization is not granted what relationship would it have to your future planning for this installation?

Admiral CLARK. I think I would have to get Admiral Withington to answer that.

It is my understanding we will have to move the rocket launcher somewhere else, at tremendous expense, or not do the type of testing which is required. That would mean our rockets in service would bring about a high percentage of duds.

NAVAL ORDNANCE AEROPHYSICS LABORATORY, DAINGERFIELD, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory at Daingerfield, Tex.," where you ask for $1,111,000 for steam ejectors and barometric condensers.

I note at this installation the plant value is $14,409,956; funded construction not in the plant value, $349,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,111,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,111,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $1,184,000.

Will you present your justification for the funds requested?

Admiral CLARK. At present we have 4 steam jet ejectors in operation and 2 are being installed.

With the proposed 6 we will have 12. These added ejectors are required first to provide a means for testing ram-jet engines now under development over their entire altitude range.

Second, this is to provide facilities to study and develop engines for higher speed missiles. Each ejector requires 30,000 pounds of steam an hour. Therefore we will require 360,000 pounds of steam for ejectors alone.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is part of another project to which we referred yesterday, is it not, insofar as this type of ejector is concerned? We are not talking about the installation of it, but the fabrication.

Didn't we have something on that yesterday?

Admiral CLARK. I don't recall it, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering status of this, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This has been thoroughly advance planned by the district public works officer, 8th Naval District, at Government expense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this project has been screened by those who should do this work. Is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, EARLE, N. J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next item, naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J., refrigerated mine battery storage building, $59,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $52,006,563; funded construction not in the plant value, $73,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $59,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $59,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $155,000.

Admiral CLARK. This item is to provide refrigerated storage for batteries which will extend the shelf life of batteries two and a half times over the experience during normal temperatures.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are these batteries typical of the so-called standard batteries? They are larger, of course, but they are comparable with other batteries.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. These are to be used in mine components.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of their sensitivity, as it were, you find it necessary to keep them in cold storage for preservation purposes as against the so-called dry storage used for batteries of lesser characteristics. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir. We think we will amortize this project in a very few years because our replacement program, that is the procurement program can be cut because we will not have so many worn out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the temperatures under which these batteries have to be kept?

Admiral CLARK. Minus 30 degrees, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature connected with this situation, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This was advance planned by the district public works office of the 3d Naval District. A complete analysis was made of this project, and again the cost of the advance planning was absorbed by the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would assume that for the requirement referred to by the Admiral, that any standard type of cold storage would meet the specification requirements. Is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course it would all depend on your tonnage displacement to meet your degree requirement?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, in your justifications, under the factual data, you have pointed out that this installation acts as a principal overseas transshipment point for Armed Forces ammunition.

Does that mean that this installation serves all the branches of the military?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In your comment about amortization, was it your contention that this renovation and other activities such as overhaul, are a money-saving operation in that it eliminates need for additional new ammunition? Was that the point?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, FALLBROOK, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the next item, naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif., where you asked for $514,000.

This is composed of two subsidiary requirements, to wit, ammunition renovation facility, where you ask for $326,000, and ammunition storage and test facility, $188,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $8,541,472; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $514,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $514,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $2,500,000.

You will present your justifications.

Admiral CLARK. This is for renovating the ammunition used by marines at Camp Pendleton and by the fleet in the San Diego area. The renovation consists of segregating it, maintaining its exterior and modification, that is disassembling certain parts and replacing parts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is the same type of renovation you have used heretofore when you are in the field of renovating ammunition?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. We have at present to ship this to Hawthorne, and again we would save the handling and transportation charges, and we expect that it will amortize itself in less than 2 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the storage and test facility? Is that a dry-storage operation?

Admiral CLARK. This is to test in a controlled atmosphere every 6 months this ammunition so as to insure its serviceability. We need explosion-proof wiring, air conditioning, and fire protection, and that is what you will notice is listed under some of the charges in item 2.

We need this by June of 1956, if possible, to meet our production schedule.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is a specialized weapon facility, is it not?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, it is.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps you had better call it a specialized facility for special types of ammunition.

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering characteristic connected with this, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance planned by the district public works officer, 11th Naval District. The cost again is absorbed in the cost of the operation of the office of the district public works officer, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. In this operation of an ammunition depot, and more specifically the renovation facility, is it necessary to have large areas of land in connection with it in order to isolate it from anything else by way of buildings and people?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is right, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that the reason why you have in connection with this depot some 9,147 acres, and in the one in New Jersey you show 11,000 acres?

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is that the principal reason?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, there are large areas of land not used but which separate this depot from civilian and other military operations?

Admiral CLARK. Except for the "not used" that is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What is the exception?

Admiral CLARK. Except for the phrase "not used" that is correct. We do use that land for storage, in other words, for underground magazines. We use the land but do not give it a high rate of utilization. These things must be separated.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I didn't mean to imply that, because I assumed, too, that you had to have wide distances between magazines and other operations there.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, HAWTHORNE, NEV.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, pick up the next item, naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev., where you ask for $1,424,000.

This is composed of low-cost housing and community improvements, $160,000; development of water supply systems, $504,000; and completion of barricades at loading docks, $760,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $71,986,923; funded construction not in the plant value, $7,362,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,424,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,424,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $13,611,000.

Present your justifications for the housing first, please, and then proceed with the other two thereafter.

Admiral CLARK. The first is for improvements in a low cost housing area where civilian workmen at the depot are housed, and it provides for curb studies and sidewalks for that area, which as you know is in the middle of the desert, sir, and is subjected to flash floods and also a great deal of dust.

This will permit them to drive their cars and also to grow grass in the other areas which they keep up themselves if the proper drainage can be obtained.

The second item is for the development of the water supply systems. We had to drill a well in the fall of 1954, and the new estimates of snowfall from the mountains, which usually results in provision of more water for Hawthorne, has been far below normal so that we must provide a means of segregating the potable water from the other water to make sure that we utilize all the water that is available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you still having trouble with the stock in that area?

Admiral WITHINGTON. I know of none, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You had some a year ago. They were encroaching on your streams and giving you some trouble. At least that is the testimony we had on this particular operation at Hawthorne as I recall it.

Admiral WITHINGTON. As you know, sir, the mountain range and desert there——

Mr. SHEPPARD. There was encroachment on the north side. It seems the Forestry Department leased some land there for stock purposes and you were having some difficulty.

Admiral WITHINGTON. I never heard of it, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Admiral CLARK. The last item is to complete the barricades at the loading docks for safety purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of this engineeringwise, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. Item No. 1 was advance planned by the Indenco Engineers, Inc., Oakland, Calif., at a cost of $4,700.

Item No. 2 was advance planned by the same concern at a cost of $2,000.

Item No. 3 was advance planned by the office of the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what depth do you have to go in those wells to get a supply of water?

Captain LAIRD. Eight to nine hundred feet on an average, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All pumping and no artesian?

Captain LAIRD. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Why is this ammunition depot located in Nevada? Is it because of a central location for this type of operation for all services?

Admiral WITHINGTON. No, sir. This is the backup depot for the Pacific Fleet behind the Sierra Nevada Mountains. It was bought in the 1920's and consists of 250 square miles. It is an enormous place, mostly mountain range.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. We have expended considerable sums here in connection with this operation and there is a tremendous area of land involved in this operation. I am wondering if there is any relationship to the general atomic operations which take place in that section of the country?

Admiral WITHINGTON. No, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all.

NAVAL POWDER FACTORY, INDIAN HEAD, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.," wherein you request a total of $1,107,000, made up of 2 contributory requirements, improvement of potable water system in the amount of $460,000, and experimental propellant processing facilities in the amount of $647,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $27,866,425; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,154,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,230,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,230,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $2,884,000.

Will you present your justifications for those requirements?

Admiral CLARK. The first item is for improvement of the potable water system, sir. We have placed new production facilities into operation and we have greater occupancy of title VIII housing so that there is an increased daily consumption of potable water by one-half million gallons a day. For safe operation, about 50 percent of the daily consumption should be available in storage. The proposed item will increase the storage from 13 percent to 43 percent, which will alleviate the present critical storage deficiency and eliminate the existing danger of contamination from overpumping of existing wells.

The second item is for experimental propellant processing facilities. The Bureau of Ordnance is working on the development of new type solid propellants for guns, missiles, and so on, but has insufficient space for the operation and requires the items listed, totaling $647,000, for this experimental processing facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. With respect to item 1, it was advance planned by Carlson & Sweatt of New York City at a cost of $3,650. The second item was advance planned by Day & Zimmerman of Philadelphia at a cost of $5,841.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION, INYOKERN, CHINA LAKE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, reflected as the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, China Lake, Calif., wherein you request $375,000 for a chapel.

I note at this installation the plant value is $162,285,950; funded construction not in the plant value, $10,151,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $375,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $375,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $13,101,000.

I would like to know if you have a chapel there at the present time.

Admiral CLARK. They are holding chapel in one of the buildings, but we have no regular chapel. There is a total population including dependents of about 11,000 and there now is room to seat only about 125.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. This chapel was advance planned by Austin, Field & Fry of Los Angeles, Calif., at a cost of $2,900.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

NAVAL TORPEDO STATION, KEYPORT, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Wash.," wherein you are making a request for $376,000 for a quality evaluation laboratory.

I note at this installation the plant value is $8,204,215; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $572,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $572,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $486,000.

I wish you would define that term, "quality evaluation laboratory."

Admiral CLARK. This laboratory ascertains the quality and the operability of torpedoes. They make control sampling inspections of various torpedo overhaul activities and during the last 2 years there has been an indication that there is a general deterioration beyond the normal expectation, so this laboratory will try to pin down what components of the torpedo are going bad and whether we have a right to expect we can leave them on the shelf 6 months, 2 years, or 3 years, and which parts give way. In this way we hope to set up an automatic renovation of only those parts that are shown to need renovation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume this laboratory will have quite a control factor over your inventory requirements, will it not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes; it will.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That in itself should prove economical as against the indeterminable factors.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. This item was advance planned by Gould, Johnson & Ridley, of Seattle, Wash., at a cost of $1,740.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?
Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.
Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Ordnance Plant, Louisville, Jefferson County, Ky.," wherein you are requesting $927,000 for an Ordnance drawing storage, reproduction, and revision facility.

I note at this installation the plant value is $10,132,030; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $927,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $927,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $840,000.

Present your justifications for this requirement.

Admiral CLARK. The magnitude of the job of storing prints and reproductions of Ordnance equipment is perhaps well expressed by this data. The Bureau of Ordnance has military drawings and reproductions in storage totaling 6 million. They reproduce each year 9 million. There are 15,000 drawing revisions a year and 150,000 new military drawings are made a year. This is to take the storage part of this operation out of the gun factory, where they are very crowded for space, and also to provide an additional storage facility.

We also cross-file Army drawings and we want to store them in Louisville.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many times are those drawings referred to where they reflect economic benefits to the Department?

Admiral WITHINGTON. One important factor is this plant is an additional headquarters for the Bureau of Ordnance. Therefore, it is important to have the master drawings at the same time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know you have to provide a place to store your drawings. That is a naval requirement, is it not?

Admiral WITHINGTON. It is not only a naval requirement. We must have drawings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But once you have accomplished the end purpose of the drawings and specifications, what further service do those drawings contribute to your operations as of next month and next year? Are we protecting the drawings as a matter of preserving records, or are we protecting drawings that have a beneficial reaction on the expenditure of funds?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Each ship has photoprints of all its drawings. As modifications are made it is necessary to show the modifications so that there is a continuing need for the drawings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think we have discussed in the past the possibility of microfilming to conserve space. What study has been made of that and what conclusion has been reached?

Admiral WITHINGTON. We have gone into microfilming extensively with correspondence. We have not found it effective with drawings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My attention has been called to the following language in the justifications:

> It is urgent that this be provided for in fiscal year 1956 to relieve the seriously overloaded facility at the Naval Gun Factory and to comply with strategic requirements for relocating vital records in areas safer from attack than Washington.

And yet when we look over your preferential sheet, if I may use that terminology, we find it in the semideferred category, in other words, supplemental funding. Yet in the justifications you contend it is extremely urgent to effect it in fiscal year 1956. What is the compatibility of the two statements?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Obviously they are not compatible. My own position, which I think is sound, is that this is an urgent need.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then the statement in your justifications is the proper one?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That leads me to ask the next question, gentlemen, Why was it classified as a secondary requirement if it has this urgency?

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, everything in this book is urgent and if we could we would like to take them up this year. This is one of the things we felt we could take a calculated risk on because we can operate at a risk for another year under these very unsatisfactory conditions. That is true of all these supplemental fundings. They are not nonurgent; they are extremely urgent; but we had to put the things we were actually operating today first. We are operating and we felt we can operate another year, but it is not desirable to do so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is another case where you have considered first things must come first and then you have made certain selections as to which things you think are first?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Hark, Stern, Lewis & Henry, of Louisville, Ky., at a cost of $4,000.

NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, MACON, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Ga., wherein you request $3,800,000 for an inert manufacturing building.

I note at this installation the plant value is $4,698,537; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $3,800,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $3,800,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $562,000.

Gentlemen, let us have a full explanation of this type of operation because it is one that every once in a while we wonder about.

Admiral CLARK. This item, Mr. Chairman, provides for the construction of an industrial-type building for manufacturing inert components of ordnance material. By relieving the present overcrowding of production machinery, the plant capacity will increase 25 percent with no increase in personnel, resulting in annual savings to the Government of $778,000. The cost of this facility will be amortized in less than 5 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a type of production that cannot be done by private business?

Admiral CLARK. It can be done by private business, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How did you get by the Secretary of Defense with this, Admiral?

Admiral CLARK. Because he was convinced that because of the nature of this particular operation, in the first place he was not sure

private interests would be interested in it; and the second thing is that it gives a continuity of know-how that the Government can control so that in the event of rapid expansion during war private business can move in and take over the specialized type of operation conducted here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total personnel you would use when this building was completed for fabrication and production purposes?

Admiral CLARK. We would be able to get along with about 1,500 civilians, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is this type of work being done?

Admiral CLARK. It is being done in this plant in overcrowded facilities and I think perhaps Captain Laird of the Bureau of Ordnance can show you the conditions as they are now.

Captain LAIRD. [Indicating on chart.] These machines are drill presses and they are, as you can see, in a very crowded situation. Behind them are some other machines. You can see there is hardly any aisle space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the first place, it is obvious your presses are modern. We assume that because of the contour of them. Now what is the space between your operating seats?

Captain LAIRD. About 1½ feet between the drill presses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And what is the largest object that can be used in the drill presses?

Admiral WITHINGTON. These are for small parts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have no large part drills?

If you do it would undoubtedly be the last one there; is that correct?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes.

On the question of private industry, private industry does about 95 percent of this work. This is the only pilot plant we have in this field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it reasonable to assume that you perfect the methods of operation and then blueprint those methods and present them to private industry for their production in order to avoid experimental work in this field?

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is true, similar to the way the pilot gun factories operate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead with your presentation, Captain.

Captain LAIRD. The aisles are so narrow that modern material handling equipment cannot be put in here and the material must be handled by hand labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many square feet do you contemplate adding to that facility?

Captain LAIRD. We now have 40,000 square feet. The new building will have approximately 170,000 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you will pick up the mechanical devices in this building and put them in the new building?

Captain LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will the space be for the operators in the new building?

Captain LAIRD. I cannot give the exact figure but it will be in accordance with the machine-tool practices.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. I do not have the figures.

Admiral CLARK. A thorough study of this was made both by the Navy and by private engineers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume the new building is based on what we call the standard placement category?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What use will you put the old building to when the new building is completed?

Admiral WITHINGTON. These are warehouses and will revert to that use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this building air-conditioned?

Admiral WITHINGTON. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the new building be air-conditioned?

Admiral WITHINGTON. No.

Captain LAIRD. It will be well ventilated, however.

Admiral PERRY. It need not be air-conditioned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the temperature condition in that part of Georgia?

Admiral WITHINGTON. It is hot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thought it was conceded you had a more efficient operation in air-conditioned buildings.

Admiral WITHINGTON. Generally I think that is a true statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If that is the case, what is the mean temperature in that particular place, can anybody tell me?

Captain LAIRD. It goes to 100.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has been known to go to 118, has it not?

Captain LAIRD. I believe it has.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It seems to me if you want to get the peak efficiency out of these employed there you should have it air-conditioned and it would amortize itself in from 3 to 3½ years.

Admiral WITHINGTON. I think the explanation is we did not feel the expense would justify it.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I cannot help but feel that the chairman has raised 1 or 2 important questions which are pertinent at the moment in that if this specifically relates to the Government going into business or expanding or remaining in business where it is possible the Navy might utilize private business for these parts, it raises the point of competition with private enterprise. Is the manufacture of these component parts competitive with private manufacturers?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, private business does function and make these parts?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And is it reasonable to assume that they would if the Navy did not continue or expand this business? Can private business be expected to meet your requirements if given an opportunity to do so?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Mr. Ostertag, the reservoir of talent and skill is there. The procurement is dropping off drastically and we would lose the skill of the contractors if we did not have one plant that was our own. This is more pertinent with a gun factory than with this.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That may be true, Admiral, but have you endeavored to determine the capacity of private industry in this field?

Admiral WITHINGTON. There is plenty of capacity, sir. There is keen competition currently.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And yet you feel the Navy is justified in such production?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. On what grounds?

Admiral WITHINGTON. On the grounds that we have a facility which is completely under our own control which is capable of taking experimental orders, proving the design, so that we will have production drawings available to give to industry.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But out Defense Establishment is doing business with private industry in all important fields of military production. Why should this particular item or items be separated as something requiring experimentation within the control of the Navy as compared with other items that you are contracting for production? These items are no more essential, are they, than many other things that are manufactured by private enterprise?

Admiral WITHINGTON. This goes back a long ways. The Army Ordnance and Bureau of Ordnance both have maintained control of explosive ammunition components and their assembly.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How is this $778,000 per year saving to be brought about? On what grounds do you figure that you can save that much money?

Admiral WITHINGTON. By the layout with an efficient plant. Captain Laird has more details on that.

Captain LAIRD. The savings is made up of several items. First, the new building will remove the presently congested machinery layout resulting in an estimated saving of $264,000 per year.

Secondly, the present layout does not permit flexibility of tools for a streamlined production flow, and the new building would result in an estimated saving of $102,000 annually on this.

Third, due to the present crowded conditions defective parts and acceptable parts are sometimes mixed in the process of moving those parts. The new building will provide the proper room for inspection of parts and we estimate we will save $63,000 per year on that.

The limited covered working area that we now have often forces us to store parts on the outside, exposing them to the weather at certain times. By being able to store them inside in the production building we expect to save $4,000 per year.

By having our bar stock issue room in close proximity to our production tooling, we expect to save $30,000 per year.

We will have improved storage inasmuch as the new building will make additional warehousing available because we can convert these buildings back to their original purpose, and that will save approximately $200,000 per year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Captain, these are all savings based on your own estimates in connection with the long-run operation of your own plant but they are not comparative savings, are they, to what can be done other than through the expansion of this plant, in other words, by going into the open market or contracting with private enterprise for these component parts?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are you comparing it with what it would cost you to go out in the open market and contract for it?

Admiral CLARK. No.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then this savings is based on savings in your own operation only?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This plant, I take it from your justifications, was established in November 1941?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. As a wartime requirement?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And this project is for more or less an expansion of existing facilities?

Admiral CLARK. It is in size but it is not in operation. After the war another plant at Milledgeville, Ga., was shut down and this is to continue at our present operating rate with fewer people and at less cost.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Your planned estimate for civilian personnel is 1,750 while at the present time you are employing 2,024. What is the reason for the reduction?

Captain LAIRD. There is a reduction in the total output for next year coming up.

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is strictly output rather than the fact it will require less personnel?

Captain LAIRD. This 1,750 does not reflect the further reduction that would be possible if we had more operating space.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How are these civilian people compensated? Is it piecework?

Captain LAIRD. No, sir. They are paid by the hour.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How does their compensation compare with the compensation paid by private enterprise in the same field?

Captain LAIRD. I am sure the relationship is about the same. We have boards that compare local wages with what we are paying and we have comparable figures.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, when you go into your wage adjustment it is on a local basis, in a local area?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I just wanted that part of it understood.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are there any private industrial plants manufacturing these component parts in the general area of or a comparable area to Macon, Ga.?

Admiral WITHINGTON. This industry is pretty widely scattered over the United States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then you can compare your wage scale with that of private industry making the same products in a comparable area?

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And you believe there is no substantial difference between your scale and theirs?

Admiral WITHINGTON. There may be a temporary one but surveys are held once a year in each wage area and we pay a comparable scale to that paid in the local labor market.

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is generally true that Government can produce cheaper than private enterprise because of such factors as taxation and capital expenditure which are an important part of the cost of doing business. It seems to me that the matter of wages and wage scales, if the same by comparison, should be a known point in determining need for this expansion and the justification for it.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. May I ask one question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral, as I understand this is more or less a yardstick, this particular factory?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. If it were not for the Navy operating this plant you believe you would pay considerably more for the finished product?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Stephens & Wilkinson of Atlanta, Ga., at a cost of $5,447.

NAVAL UNDERWATER ORDNANCE STATION, NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now pick up the next item, "Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I.," wherein you are requesting $370,000 for a torpedo launching devices test facility.

The plant value is $15,813,077; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $370,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $370,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $2,174,000.

Will you present your justifications for that requirement?

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this project is to modify an existing building for use as a torpedo launching devices test facility. We want to test both above-water and below-water launchers and we want to do it under controlled conditions and with instrumented torpedoes and launchers because if we continue to test these launchers in the fleet we do not get the accuracy we would get in this facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many comparable operations of this character do you have in the United States?

Admiral CLARK. This will be the only one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance-planned by Oresto DiSaia, of Providence, R. I., at a cost of $2,625.

NAVAL MAGAZINE, PORT CHICAGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now pick up the next item which is reflected as "Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.," wherein you are requesting $241,000 for an X-ray housing facility.

At this installation the plant value is $31,474,082; funded construction not in the plant value, $2,438,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,929,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,929,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $559,000.

Will you present your justifications for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is another case where an error in the Department deleted item 1 as a result of the action of the House Armed Services Committee that actually should not have been deleted until the action of the Senate committee and the result of the conferees had been ascertained. I would like the chairman's permission to tell him about this first item, which is the acquisition of land, where we are requesting authority to acquire 4,520 acres at a cost of $1,688,000, and I will provide the backup sheets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman knows, what was the reason for the deletion?

Admiral CLARK. There were extensive hearings on this. It was opposed by certain local elements who were engaged in industry in the area. Our reason for acquiring or desiring to acquire the land is to provide a safety distance at this major west coast outloading facility. Some of the people engaged in industry and some of the real-estate people, I imagine, apparently were willing to take a calculated risk and continue to operate in this area despite the fact we had a disastrous explosion there, as you know.

The dark green area on the map is what we own at present. The ammunition storage is in the lower part and there are outloading facilities consisting of piers along the waterfront.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are you presently doing the work that would be done on this acquired land?

Admiral CLARK. This acquisition is merely to provide safety distances and prevent further people coming into this area and being endangered in case of possible explosions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are you doing the work now?

Admiral CLARK. We are outloading on our own land along the waterfront where the dark green is. The ships tie up, load ammunition, and sail.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that is the location where you had your explosions?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice a break between the lighter green portion of the map and the dark green. The lighter green is property already under your control?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. That is what we want to acquire. It includes those off-lying islands, as you see there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the population of that light green area that you wish to acquire?

Captain LAIRD. Approximately 2,709 at Port Chicago, and approximately 200 over here in the town of Nichols.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What industry, if any, operates in the area?

Captain LAIRD. There is a general chemical plant right here. That is the only plant of any note that is within this 2-mile circle.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the employable staff in the chemical plant, if you know?

Captain LAIRD. I do not know.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of an operation is it? Have you any idea about that?

Captain LAIRD. No, sir.

Admiral WITHINGTON. We guess the acquisition cost would be about $2.5 million, if we bought that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, you would not consider buying the rest of the property and excluding that, would you?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Admiral CLARK. That is what we are doing this year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand it, the chemical plant houses a large employable list of people?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Approximately how many people are being employed in the chemical plant?

Captain LAIRD. In this town of Nichols, which is associated with the chemical plant, there are 200 people. There are 60 housing units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have 200 people within that area and how many people do you have in the rest of the area you want to acquire?

Captain LAIRD. We have approximately 2,700 in this town and we have a few scattered farmers around the rest of the area—very few, though.

Admiral CLARK. Except for one thing, we are not asking this year to acquire Port Chicago, or Nichols. We are asking only to acquire the green part, less those gray areas, with the thought this year of asking for this land so that no new people will move in. It was brought out in the hearing of the other committees we were not protecting the people in Port Chicago and in Nichols and I think the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance testified if we thought we could afford it, we would like to acquire the whole business. So this is a preventive measure, to prevent a bad situation by further encroachment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again, if you are going to evaluate that total concept of procurement of land upon the premise of hazard to the people, I do not see how you can overlook the hazard to the people already there, and particularly where they are concentrated. It is a little difficult for me to draw that line of demarcation where the human element applies. I admit if you have no control over this land your encroachment will obviously intensify.

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Which is not going to make it any easier; but in order to do a thorough protective job, you would have to take in all of those properties with everybody there, too.

Admiral WITHINGTON. The most logical thing for me to do is to ask for the full acquisition of this land.

Mr. ANDREWS. What size place is Port Chicago; approximately how many people?

Admiral WITHINGTON. 2,700.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Where is this X-ray housing facility?

Admiral WITHINGTON. In the rear area. We have no safety problems in the rear area.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But that is where it would be?

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is right.

Admiral CLARK. That is not involved in this area; that is away down.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the area to the extreme right of the picture, further back to the edge of the picture?

Captain LAIRD. This is all private property. The town of Pittsburg is over here, off of the map [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question but that if you do not do something about this acquisition of land, you are going to have continual encroachment; because the real estate people will build houses and people will want houses and many will be bought; therefore, even if it is in a bad situation people will encroach upon it because of the proximity to their work and other conveniences. That has followed historically. And I, individually, would look with a little more happiness on this situation if you were cleaning the whole thing up and getting them out of the area; because, if you do not, and you do have another repetition of what you had previously, you are going to injure a lot more people.

Admiral WITHINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By the way, what did the settlements, as a result of the explosion, cost the United States?

Captain LAIRD. Approximately between $3 and $5 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we have had 1 explosion that cost between $3 million and $5 million, so I think we might compromise and say $3.5 million, to be sure. Yet you are asking for $1,688,000. And if you had a repetition of the explosion problem, you would only be avoiding it proportionately if you get the amount of money you request, because of the exposure of the concentrated population that is there.

From the dollar point of view would you consider this land program as vital to the welfare of the Navy's economy as you would that of the extension of Macon, Ga.?

Admiral WITHINGTON. From the practical standpoint of dollars, there is no comparison with Macon, Ga. Macon will be giving more return to the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But the Macon, Ga., plant is not in the field of explosive and dangerous elements that prevail at this location, is it?

Admiral WITHINGTON. No. The plant we are asking for at Macon is to make the inert parts of the explosive.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, that is the industrial part of your requirement?

Admiral WITHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you are asking for a land investment here for the preservation of the safety and protection of the people at that particular area—Port Chicago?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. You stated this has been appraised?

Admiral PERRY. This has been appraised by Kenneth H. Smitten, of San Francisco, Calif. I do not have before me the fee which he was paid for that appraisal, but I will furnish it for the record.

(The following was submitted later:)

The cost of this appraisal was $900.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the dark green shown on the map near the waterfront completely surrounded by a fence?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir; we have a fence all the way around here [indicating].

Mr. ANDREWS. Then the citizens of Port Chicago cannot get over into that section?

Captain LAIRD. This area right here [indicating] is completely fenced.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Right on that same point raised by Mr. Andrews, in order that we may clearly understand the relationship, is it the light green area that you would like to acquire?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And the project in the justification would be located on the dark green in the lower part, known as ammunition storage?

Admiral CLARK. That is where the X-ray facility would be, which is the next item.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is where it would be located?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you already have access between the two dark green areas?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Admiral WITHINGTON. The Government owns that land.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That line represents the access. What is that?

Admiral CLARK. That is the rail and road leading from the storage outloading docks.

Captain LAIRD. That is owned by the Government.

Admiral CLARK. Owned by the Government, controlled by the Government.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Why do you propose to delete the gray part known as Port Chicago from the others when they are really a part of the area?

Admiral CLARK. Because we did not think we could afford to buy this land. We can get this other land now when it is unimproved and take the first step towards increasing the safety of this operation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But in response to the chairman you pointed out that the main objective was the safety factor.

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yet you do not propose to eliminate the very source of your trouble, namely the area where these people and the explosive areas are located.

Admiral CLARK. As a first step, we want to prevent a bad situation from getting worse. We will consider next year whether we cannot come in and buy up Port Chicago and Nichols.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Certainly anybody who wanted to build there and required a loan of any kind would have difficulty in obtaining financial help either from veterans' housing, Federal housing, or even a bank. Who would loan people money to build in such a hazardous spot? I do not believe anyone would extend credit who is familiar with that type of business. In fact, does not the actual location of your operations there eliminate the danger or fear of that around the harbor?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; because the bay area is growing with tremendous rapidity. Land values throughout the whole area are soaring and actually people who came and testified from nearby before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I think, said there was a possibility of industrial expansion and people were willing to come in there in spite of the hazard, because it was waterfront property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On the loan aspect, you have many instances that I have observed around the continental United States where people will secure loans from banks and perhaps in some instances—and this I do not know—under title IX might get funds and move right up

at the end of a runway. And I have seen it done not only in one place, but all over the United States. Why the public will move into a hazardous area of that character, I do not know. Perhaps some of them are working there and wish to be in close proximity to their work. But they can get funds to build in areas of that character. And I suppose the people who loan the money protect the loan by insurance.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In any event, your request for authorization has been denied for the acquisition of this land?

Admiral CLARK. It was denied by one committee and approved by the other committee.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But until you have approval of both Houses, you have no authorization?

Admiral CLARK. We have no authorization for anything in this book, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I understand that; but to a certain extent it is reasonable to assume that the most of these requests will be authorized; but here is one where there is a conflict, so that it is not reasonable to assume that it is likely to be approved?

Admiral CLARK. I do not agree. I think each one of these projects should be approved.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not questioning your opinion; I am referring to the realities of the legislative processes where one House objects or deletes such an item. Until that item is restored or agreed to by both the House and the Senate, you just have not the authorization.

Admiral CLARK. Last year at the conference things were put back in and nothing was cut out. So we have hopes this will be one of the things that will be put in.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all I have.

(The following was submitted later:)

A requirement exists for construction of a facility to house a 2 million electron volt X-ray which is now on hand. At present, the depot must continue the hazardous and expensive method of breakdown of ammunition for surveillance purposes even though it has been demonstrated that certain material can be examined by the use of X-ray equipment which is a cheap and nondestructive method. Estimate, $241,000.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, ST. JULIENS CREEK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, entitled "Naval Ammunition Depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va.," where you are asking for a central steam plant at an estimated cost of $420,000.

The plant value is $9,239,433; funded construction not in the plant value, $267,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $420,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $420,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $871,000.

Present your justification for this item, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is for a central steam plant at St. Juliens Creek. At present the steam plant is in a wood frame building built in 1931 of old and deteriorated materials. It is a fire hazard. The boiler foundations are settling so that every one of the heating boilers broke down during the past heating season, although they were overhauled.

This item will provide a proper building for the steam plant and permit us to operate in a more economical building, that is, more economical to maintain.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this project, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. That was advance planned by Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, of Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $2,300.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AMMUNITION AND NET DEPOT, SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item entitled "Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.," wherein you are making a request for $1,029,000 for improvement to waterfront facilities.

At this installation the plant value is $18,758,033; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,603,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,029,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,029,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $323,000.

Describe for the benefit of the committee the improvements contemplated at Seal Beach to the extent of the funds requested.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the expense of strengthening the pier and dredging the approach channel to the ammunition depot at Seal Beach. This, as you know, is the principal ammunition depot servicing ships in the southern California area and we must now barge this ammunition out. As a result, the expense and hazard of rehandling is great. In 1953, we had as many as 307 ships in explosive anchorages. We expect to save on labor and dunnage and barge repairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have had some correspondence with the municipality at Seal Beach relative to the operations of this particular installation on behalf of the Navy wherein the contention is made—whether rightly or wrongly—that considerable erosion has taken place in the beach area.

What is the situation and will the present proposal, dredging and various and sundry other things required under this proposed appropriation, accentuate or solve the problem?

Admiral WITHINGTON. This project has an indirect benefit to the community in that the dredged material, mostly sand, can be dumped in the eroded beach area and will be. It is probable the erection by the Navy of the breakwater to make the present harbor did have an effect on beach erosion. So we will get an indirect benefit to the community from that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Aside from the indirect benefit you will get by dredging operations you contemplate doing here, what if anything is your connection with the breakwater aspect of the situation? Is the Navy interested in that program, or not? I mean financially and otherwise.

Admiral WITHINGTON. We have no interest except a desire to have good community relations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The extension of the breakwater would fall within the purview of the Army engineers, would it not?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What if anything has the erosion effect been upon the Navy's functions alone?

Admiral WITHINGTON. None.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are staying far enough back away and the effectiveness of that does not bother you?

Admiral WITHINGTON. The effectiveness is outside of the breakwater; not inside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that, within itself, create silting within the basin where you are functioning? Do not you get some auxiliary floating of material in there and siltation?

Admiral PERRY. You get a certain amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the breakwater is carried out to protect the area, the degree of siltation you do have, whatever it may be, would be halted; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. I would judge so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the common engineering approach to it?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. This whole project has been advance planned by Moffet & Nichols, Inc., of Long Beach, Calif., at a cost of $5,000.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, SHUMAKER, ARK.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item entitled "Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Ark.," wherein you are asking for a barricaded transfer depot in the amount of $765,000.

The plant value is $112,467,419; funded construction not in the plant value, $32,255,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $765,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $765,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $16,821,000.

Present your justification for this requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. This item provides a facility for the transfer and segregation of ammunition in compliance with explosive safety regulations. In the first 9 months of 1954, the depot had received 5,600 tons and in April of 1954 3,500 tons had not been segregated. The workload is going up particularly in rocket segregation, including rockets for our ships. This is urgently needed so that we can do this segregation under safe conditions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as the barricades are concerned, that is definitely a safety device requirement, is it not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the situation pertaining to the access railroad, wherein you are asking for $120,000?

Captain LAIRD. That is a short section of railroad to enable access to the transfer depot from the main station line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it a stub spur going into your depot?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir, from the station to the main line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By the way, you are doing your own switch back up in your yard within the confines of the depot, are you not?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance planned by E. M. Freeman & Associates of Little Rock, Ark., at a cost of $2,900.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item, "Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md." wherein you are asking for $1,976,000 to modernize aeroballistics facilities.

At this installation the plant value is $4,396,323; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,721,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,976,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,976,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $1,917,000.

Present your justification for that requirement, please.

Admiral Clark. At this facility we test both gun-launched and jet-propelled guided missiles. This item will provide for the construction of a new hypersonic wind tunnel where research on planes, missiles, and projectiles can be carried on at higher speeds than now possible with the present facility.

Mr. Sheppard. Is this a new project?

Admiral Clark. It is a modernization of an inadequate facility in order to permit us to test these projectiles and missiles at higher speeds than we can now test them.

Mr. Sheppard. I presume under section 2 of item 1, wherein you refer to "supersonic tunnel-diffuser and test section" that this is the same type operation as a test cell wherein you want to suppress the noise emanating from the work you operate; otherwise why would you want a diffuser test section in there? What does the word "diffusion" mean?

Admiral Withington. The diffuser section is the place where the air expands and the test cell is an isolated area which is built to withstand explosion. The two are entirely different. This is the area where the model being tested is inserted in the wind tunnel.

Mr. Sheppard. How large are you going to build the test cell section, and is that a test cell literally?

Admiral Withington. No, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. It is merely a test section and has nothing to do with noise suppression?

Admiral Withington. No.

Admiral Perry. This project was advance-planned by the district public works officer, Potomac River Naval Command.

Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va.

Mr. Sheppard. Proceed with the next one entitled "Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va.," wherein you are asking for $113,000 for the purpose of establishing an ammunition storage and test facility.

The plant value is $23,213,208; funded construction not in the plant value, $5,791,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $113,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $113,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $2,344,000.

Present your justifications, please.

Admiral Clark. New weapons for the fleet must be stored and tested at this depot to meet the new strategic requirements. This item will provide a specialized facility to store and test the secret component of this new weapon in controlled atmosphere, to insure its

serviceability. We cannot properly store and test this component without this item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique connected with the naval mine depot at Yorktown?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance planned by Baskerville & Son, of Richmond, Va., at a cost of $1,200.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No question.

Admiral CLARK. Would this be an appropriate point to answer your question of yesterday about the safety of ammunition transportation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I had in mind was relative to highway transportation of ammunition and what was being done in general to safeguard the population where private transportation is being utilized.

I am only asking for the policy, if you have a policy, to avoid, whether by truck contractual operation or otherwise, going through semimetropolitan areas with subdivisions of population. When we have an alternate road, do we have a policy pertaining to that type of operation; if so, what is it?

Admiral STROOP. The control of traffic outside of depots over public highways depends entirely upon regulations of the ICC and the State laws and depends on whether traffic is moving. The Navy and the Department of Defense both discharge their responsibilities by insuring that the companies with which we deal go along with those regulations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That would apply to public utilities, to wit, public transportation companies of the localities.

Admiral STROOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, it would not apply to Army people wherein you are transporting in your own vehicles, which you frequently do?

Admiral STROOP. That is true, except we insist on and see to it that our own vehicles comply with all of the State and interstate regulations. We are more strict with our own than the other.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much.

ORDNANCES FACILITIE—OVERSEAS

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, OAHU, T. H.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item reflected in volume No. 3 under "Ordnance facilities—overseas," wherein we find the "Naval ammunition depot at Oahu, T. H.," for which you request $1,382,000, made up of rocket testing facility, $167,000; barricaded classification yard, west loch, $515,000; barricaded sidings, Lualualei, to the extent of $450,000, and sewage disposal plant, Lualualei, $250,000. The plant value is $39,344,215; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,610,000; existing unfunded authorization, $250,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $1,132,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $1,382,000; the estimated future appropriation required, $1,311,000.

Admiral CLARK. The first item is for a rocket-firing test facility for the purpose of maintaining the quality of surveyance of rocket motors stored at Oahu in the Western Pacific. We have a large stockpile of rocket motors, some of which were produced and assembled as far back as 1944. Recently we have had a drastic increase in the

fleet rocket motor malfunctioning. In the 8 months ending June 1954, 21 motors blew up while airborne.

We must establish an inspection and surveyance and test facility so that we can insure that this big backlog of rockets, which is valued at about $750,000 at the present moment, are in fact operable and will not be failures.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice the second item, which I think is defined rather definitely, that is, "Barricaded classification yard." It means exactly what it says; does it not?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the building is barricaded for the purpose of protecting the contents of the classified yard; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the same thing applies to the barricaded sidings.

Admiral CLARK. Correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing at the sewage-disposal plant—putting in a new one, or a replacement?

Admiral CLARK. This will replace the existing outmoded collection system which has an inadequate capacity, with a complete sewage-disposal plant and collection system of a capacity to take care of 1,400 people, which is required to abate the present health hazard that now exists.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. Item 1 was advance planned by Lemmon, Freetch & Haines, of Honolulu; item 2 by W. T. Spaulding & Co. of Honolulu; item 3 by the District public-works officer of the 14th Naval District; Item 4 by the District public-works officer of the 14th Naval District. I will furnish the cost for the record.

(The information is as follows:)

NAD, OAHU, T. H.

Item 1: Rocket firing test facility—Advance planning by Lemmon, Freetch & Haines, Honolulu, T. H., $748.

Item 2: Barricaded classification yard, West Loch—Advance planning by W. T. Spaulding & Co., Assoc., Honolulu, T. H., $1,800.

Item 3: Barricaded sidings, Lualualei—Advance planning by DPWO 14th Naval District—Government cost.

Item 4: Sewage-disposal plant, Lualualei—Advance planning by DPWO 14th Naval District—Government cost.

NAVAL ORDNANCE FACILITY, SASEBO, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan," wherein you are requesting $66,000. At this installation the plant value is unknown; funded construction not in the plant value, $30,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $66,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $66,000; the estimated future appropriation required, none.

What is the situation pertaining to that requirement?

Admiral CLARK. We have actually a messhall barracks, but an inadequate facility. Our only facility for quarters and messing will take care of only 27 men.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And what is your load requirement?

Admiral CLARK. Our load requirement is 11 officers and 129 enlisted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by the officer in charge of construction, Navy contracts, Japan, who is located in Yokosuka, but has an engineer force of his own paid for by regular public-works appropriations.

CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS, AMMUNITION STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Classified locations, ammunition storage facilities" and family housing for 1 senior officer, 1 junior officer, and 6 enlisted; family housing for 1 senior officer, 1 junior officer, and 8 enlisted. The total request is $4,820,900.

These projects are classified, so your response will be off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is considered a part of the operation within that area; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And contributes to the successful operation of the entire project to the degree that housing is required?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. We have another general project which is part of the same facility we have been discussing.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are no further questions, we want to thank you very much for your appearance and your responsive answers to the interrogations of the committee. Of course when we come to marking up the bill, we will give such consideration as we think is justified.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Our next item is "Service school facilities."

Do you have a statement, Captain, which you wish to make?

Captain RIDER. I have a statement from Vice Admiral Holloway who is unable to be here this afternoon, sir.

Would you like me to read it?

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will insert it in the record.

(The statement of Vice Adm. J. L. Holloway, Jr., is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF VICE ADM. J. L. HOLLOWAY, JR., CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The 20 items sponsored by the Chief of Naval Personnel for appropriation in the fiscal year 1956 are part of a planned program designed to provide for the augmentation of facilities necessary to meet training requirements and the replacement of essential substandard facilities inherited from the World War II era.

Our program envisions the relocation of service schools from overcrowded fleet port areas to less congested and more centralized sites. At this time our efforts are being concentrated toward developing the naval-training center, Great Lakes, Ill., as 1 of 3 service-school centers. We are asking appropriations for four items at this location. These are:

(1) A 200-man bachelor officers quarters with mess for 350 authorized by the Congress in the fiscal year 1955 program to improve the living conditions for bachelor officers assigned to this locality.

(2) Family quarters for 288 enlisted men to replace an equal number of grossly inadequate quarters converted from World War II barrack structures.

(3) The conversion of an existing permanent structure to provide for relocating the advanced interior communications electricians school from the receiving station, Washington, D. C., and combining it with the existing basic school now occupying inadequate and substandard facilities at Great Lakes.

(4) A 2,000-man combined barracks and messing facility to house enlisted student personnel as replacement for temporary wooden construction that cannot be economically rehabilitated to furnish adequate space.

The facilities at the United States Naval Academy have been grossly inadequate to accommodate the numbers of midshipmen which have been maintained there since World War II, and which must be maintained there for the foreseeable future to meet requirements. This condition has been repeatedly recognized by the annual Board of Visitors. We are therefore requesting appropriations for 2 of the more urgent major items, and 1 minor item at this location as follows:

(1) Reclamation of approximately 32.5 acres of land from the Severn River to provide badly needed outdoor physical education areas.

(2) The construction of two additional wings to Bancroft Hall to relieve the grossly overcrowded housing conditions for midshipmen now existing.

(3) The correction of a serious deficiency in the electrical distribution system to Bancroft Hall and certain academic buildings.

The 450 enlisted personnel requiring barracks facilities at the United States Naval Station, Annapolis, Md., are now being crowded into quarters designed to accommodate 250 men. This condition has an adverse effect on both the morale and health of these men. Accordingly, we are requesting adequate barracks accommodations at this location.

The naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif., was built during the peak period of World War II. Consequently, the structures provided were of the most temporary nature and, at this time, have passed their economical life expectancy. This is particularly true of the barracks which are so substandard that neither rehabilitation nor conversion can provide the minimum acceptable facilities for permanent use. This condition was recognized by the Congress through the authorization and appropriation of funds in the fiscal year 1955 for the replacement of the first increment of 860 barracks spaces. We are now requesting replacement of a like number of barracks spaces as the second increment.

The facilities presently in use at Dam Neck, Va., for training in surface-launched guided missiles are totally inadequate to meet the planned needs of the fleet. The training phase for these missiles was originally started on an interim basis by utilization of facilities at various contractors' plants. Soon thereafter it became evident that the demand for personnel trained in this field was steadily increasing and that the requirement for such training was of a permanent nature. An analysis of program operations revealed that training in interim facilities at widely located activities was both expensive and inefficient. In order to effect economies and improve the quality of training, a school was established at Dam Neck, Va., in existing World War II buildings until adequate structures could be planned, funded and constructed at that location. Therefore, we have included in this program two items for the improvement of this highly essential training. These are:

(1) A school building adequate to train a minimum of 400 in the maintenance and operation of surface-launched missiles.

(2) A 118-man barracks for the housing of the additional personnel that are to be processed through the new school facilities.

These two items must be constructed simultaneously in order to permit the training of personnel in such numbers as are necessary to meet fleet requirements.

A study of accommodations provided for Bachelor officers attending the Explosive Ordnance Disposal School at Indian Head, Md., revealed that the present temporary facilities are woefully lacking in space and afford only the minimum in livability. These factors have a definite effect on the health, morale, and academic performance of the students attending this school. In recognition of this deficiency we are requesting a bachelor officer's quarters with mess to accommodate 100 officers.

The Fleet Sonar School, San Diego, Calif., is presently housed in temporary non-fire-resistant structures built during World War II as barracks. Limitations in space and restrictions on floor loading prevent the installation of required training equipment. Since the basic construction material is wood, some $10 million worth of irreplaceable equipment is in constant danger of being destroyed by fire. We are requesting the replacement of these inadequate facilities with permanent construction in order to insure improved and uninterrupted training for fleet personnel in the various aspects of antisubmarine warfare.

The recreation and welfare building used by naval personnel in the Charleston, S. C., area was destroyed by fire in 1946. Subsequently, attempts have been made to improvise facilities through the utilization of existing temporary type barracks. These arrangements have proven unsatisfactory for the recreation and welfare of the naval personnel in the Charleston area. The lack of facilities has seriously curtailed the scheduling of indoor athletic and social events with a resultant adverse effect on morale. Since we are vitally concerned with maintaining morale at a high level, we are requesting a combined recreation and welfare building at the receiving station, Charleston, S. C.

When the Naval Postgraduate School was relocated to Monterey, Calif., interim facilities in the form of the old Del Monte Hotel and related buildings were converted to the maximum extent possible to provide for necessary operations until such time as adequate facilities could be planned, funded and constructed. Messing facilities for enlisted personnel are now located on two floor levels in a temporary wood frame annex to the main hotel. These facilities are not susceptible to efficient layout or adequate sanitary control. We are requesting approval to provide an efficient and sanitary subsistence building as an adjunct to the enlisted men's barracks approved by the Congress in fiscal year 1955.

A study of the accommodations offered bachelor officers in the Philadelphia area indicates that there is a serious shortage of adequate quarters to house some 391 officers requiring accommodations. This requirement is being partially met by the use of a converted barracks in the shipyard and by leasing a private building in a commercial and industrial section of the city. These two buildings provide a total of 185 spaces. The leased building, constructed in 1911 as a school for girls, is located in an unwholesome neighborhood and furnishes substandard facilities with the resultant deleterious effect on morale. We consider that adequate bachelor officer facilities are urgently needed in the Philadelphia area and therefore, have included an item for a permanent bachelor officer's quarters with mess to accommodate 200 officers.

Existing private housing facilities in the city of Athens, Ga., do not afford adequate support for the married officer personnel assigned to the supply corps school for instruction. This condition was recognized by the Congress in Public Law 765 of the 83d Congress in which they authorized the construction of 30 units of family housing. We are therefore requesting appropriations to accomplish this item.

A new school facility which is classified is included in the program. A description of this item will be given during the hearings on classified items.

In addition to the items enumerated above, I am submitting for approval two minor construction items. These are:

(1) The construction of approved facilities for training in fire-fighting at the fleet training center, Pearl Harbor, T. H.

(2) The construction of a fire escape tower at the retraining command Portsmouth, N. H., to prevent possible loss of life in the event of a catastrophe at this activity.

These items which have been described represent a careful screening of the many requests submitted for sponsorship. As a result of this screening, it can be conscientiously said that, each is urgently required to fill a permanent need.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md

Mr. Sheppard. We will take up first the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md; wherein you make a request for $11,467,000. This is composed of three items—improve electrical system, $182,000; land reclamation, $3,785,000; and two additional dormitory wings, Bancroft Hall, $7,500,000.

At this installation the plant value is $30,321,974; funded construction not in the plant value is $6,908,000; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $11,467,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $11,467,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $27,167,000.

You will make your presentation, please.

Admiral Clark. The first item, sir, is the modification and improvement of the electrical power system. This system serves four large academic buildings, as well as Bancroft Hall.

It is an old system with undersized wiring, and the load on it is such that we are now in violation of the protection standards of the National Electrical Code.

The system is equipped with nonautomatic switches, and they are a fire hazard.

We are requesting $182,000 to provide a safe, adequate and flexible system by replacing the present one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, it seems to me that this is some of the aftermath to which you referred during your engineering residence, where you complained bitterly about some of the work which should have been done quite some time ago.

Was this a component part of what you referred to at that time?

Admiral PERRY. This would be a component part of that whole situation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What comments do you have with reference to the dormitory wings?

Admiral PERRY. Talking about item 3?

Admiral CLARK. Do you wish me to take 2 and 3 now, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CLARK. Item 2, sir, is a land reclamation. This is the first increment. In this we are requesting authority and funds for filling in the Dewey and Santee Basins, total of 32½ acres. This is to provide enough land for outdoor recreation and training facilities and athletic fields.

The next item is two additional dormitory wings at Bancroft Hall so that we will not have to continue to overcrowd the rooms as we are doing at present.

We now have 3 and 4 men in 2-man rooms and as many as 6 in rooms designed for 4.

We are asking for funding authority for both of these projects, sir. Actually, we expect to spend this year amounts required only for advance planning and we will do it out of our advance planning funds.

We would like to have these two projects approved for funding, however.

Mr. SHEPPARD. These projects were put in the bill by the Armed Services Committee?

Admiral CLARK. Yes; Armed Services Committee of the House.

They were on our program and we intended to submit them either next year or the year following.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Admiral Perry, what is the engineering situation pertaining to the item to which I have just addressed myself?

Admiral PERRY. The two dormitory wings, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. All three of the projects so far as engineering is concerned.

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning for the improvement of the primary and secondary electrical systems at Bancroft Hall was done by C. Warren Bogan, of Washington, D. C., for $925.

The land reclamation project, item 2, was advance planned by Porter, Urquhart & Beavin, of Newark, N. J., at a cost of $24,620.

I call your attention to the fact that this fee was comparatively high because that firm had to go in and take many borings in order to determine exactly the design which would fit the occasion, which

would be a steel sheet pile bulkhead to hold back the fill and the proper anchorages for that fill and that bulkhead.

The advance planning for the wings at Bancroft Hall was done by the Public Works Office of the Severen River Naval Command and, as a consequence, no fees were paid for that, sir, other than normal cost to the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With reference to your land reclamation, in the first increment which you have set up as a lump-sum operation, in other words, land reclamation is $3,700,000 and site improvements $778,000, you obviously arrive at the lump-sum figure by some process. What was it, please?

Admiral PERRY. The land reclamation in question would be accomplished by hydraulic-dredged fill with a sand blanket on top of it. We have had 1,352,000 cubic yards.

We have a steel bulkhead, 2,850 lineal feet. We would have to have concrete storm drains, 5,600 lineal feet, and vertical sand drains, 27,000 lineal feet, together with manholes, paving, 4,500 square yards of paving, 36 new moorings, salt-water intakes, salt-water screening and pumping stations, and adjustments to mechanical and electrical and communication facilities. That is the land acquisition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In reference to that reclamation function and considering the composition of the soil which will be pumped from one area to the other for fill-in purposes, is it considered that the program will be adequate or will you have to compact this at the time you are dumping in your fill?

Admiral PERRY. This entire area, Mr. Chairman, is not for construction purposes. It is for playing fields which includes 19 combination football-soccer-softball fields and which will be floodlighted. Therefore the settlement can take place gradually.

The item you mentioned, lump sum for site improvement of $778,000, includes a new electrical system, consisting of 2,100 lineal feet of distribution lines in existing ducts, 21,200 lineal feet of branch circuits and street-light cables, 16 street-light standards, 112 floodlight units and poles, 1 transformer, 1,500 kilovolt ampere, and switchgear and distribution panel. Topsoil and seeding for 32.5 acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total estimated cost of the reclamation project?

Admiral PERRY. That is reflected in the——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that reflected in the $3,007,000?

Admiral PERRY. That is the reclamation only, the part I read first.

Admiral CLARK. I think the chairman's question was directed to the fact that this was only the first increment.

The second increment would be the fill beyond Farragut Field.

Admiral PERRY. I can furnish that figure for the record, Mr. Chairman. I do not have it readily available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you please do so?

Admiral PERRY. $7,700,000 is the figure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Total of $10,077,000.

Captain RIDER. That includes the two increments, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe you referred to the engineering in your original answer, did you not, where it has to do with the dormitory wings?

Admiral PERRY. The engineering there was performed by the public works office of the Severn River Naval Command.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why did you have to go down so far?

Admiral PERRY. Sometimes you have to go down below the mud line of 40 and 50 feet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is there any other place nearby that you can use?

Admiral PERRY. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Further questions pertaining to this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No, sir.

NAVAL STATION, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Station, Annapolis, enlisted men's barracks without mess. You are asking $307,000 for that.

At this installation the plant value is $2,676,494; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $307,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $307,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $1,739,000.

Present your justifications.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the naval station right across the river from the Naval Academy proper where the enlisted men are barracked. A total of 514 enlisted men require barracks spaces for the naval station and for the nearby naval radio station, but there are only 306 spaces now available.

This project is for the construction of 172-man barracks building with the necessary collateral equipment and utilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see your cost is reflected as $10.78 per square foot. What is meant by outside utilities?

Admiral PERRY. It would be the electrical lines, 200 lineal feet, 700 lineal feet of 3-inch steam lines, 400 lineal feet of 4-inch fresh-water lines, 600 lineal feet 8-inch sanitary-sewer lines, 600 feet 6-inch and 200 lineal feet of storm sewers, 2 fireplugs, and 400 lineal feet of salt-water lines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVY SUPPLY CORPS SCHOOL, ATHENS, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga., for family housing, wherein you make the request under Public Law 765 for $456,000.

At this installation the plant value is $2,033,708; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded housing authorization is $456,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 housing authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 housing appropriation is $456,000; and the estimated future housing appropriation required is none.

Will you present your justifications for the requirement?

Admiral CLARK. This is for 30 junior officers, sir, because the private housing facilities in the city of Athens do not afford adequate support for the married officer personnel assigned to this school for instruction.

Existing private housing facilities in the city of Athens, Ga., do not afford adequate support for the married officer personnel assigned to the Supply Corps School for instruction. Local property owners are reluctant to rent on other than an annual basis which excludes student officers attending the 26-week course of instruction. Where housing is available, either rentals are exorbitant or facilities are substandard and inadequate. This item will alleviate conditions which adversely affect the morale, health, and welfare of this group of naval officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that apparently you are maintaining your officers' strength there at 43 but you drop enlisted from 69 to 22, and your civilian from 64 to nothing.

What was the reason for dropping the enlisted personnel down and maintaining the officer category?

Captain MCFARLAND. There is no change in the present and planned strength for officers and enlisted. That figure at the bottom is only those personnel eligible for family housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique?

Admiral PERRY. The same criteria applies to these quarters which has applied throughout all of these stations thus far.

In other words, there has been no advance engineering planning on this. We merely live up to the Department of Defense standard criteria.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

NAVAL RECEIVING STATION, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will take up the next item, Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C., recreation and welfare building. You are asking for $553,000 for this purpose.

At this installation the plant value is $2,263,259; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $553,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $553,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $8,932,156.

Present your justifications for it.

Admiral CLARK. In 1946 the recreation building at this activity was destroyed by fire and since then there has been no adequate covered recreation building in the area for use by naval personnel.

There is therefore urgent need for suitable building to house a gymnasium, auditorium, handball court, and similar facilities for the approximately 6,000 naval personnel who are stationed at the base or on the ships using the base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique associated with this project?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by the Office of the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District, Charleston, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, Calif.

Mr. Sheppard. Next item is the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, Calif., wherein you desire to create or construct enlisted men's barracks without mess. You are asking for $1,402,000.

At this installation the plant value is $6,928,712; funded construction not in the plant value is $2,941,200; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscay year 1956 autorization is $1,402,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $1,402,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $23,163,000.

Will you present your justification for that requirement?

Admiral Clark. This is the second increment of a barracks replacement program at Coronado, the first of which was authorized last year by Congress.

The barracks at this amphibious base are perhaps the worst we are forced to use in the whole Naval Establishment.

They are overaged, entirely of temporary construction, they do not include toilet or shower facilities, they are grossly substandard in every sense of the word.

We would like to continue this replacement program by increments.

Mr. Sheppard. Assuming that you receive the appropriation and that the structures were completed, what happens to those which you are vacating?

Admiral Clark. These would be demolished, sir, and any usable portions would be reused, and the rest would be salvaged, I imagine, Admiral Perry.

Admiral Perry. Such parts of them as could be used, Mr. Chairman, will be salvaged.

I have inspected these particular barracks and I doubt whether there would be too much which would be usable after you tore them down.

Mr. Sheppard. You would not have much other than scrap material, as I observe this.

Admiral Perry. I think even the term "scrap" is a slight exaggeration concerning those barracks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sheppard. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. Sheppard. What is the engineering technique which applies to this project?

Admiral Perry. This project was advance planned by the district public works officer, 11th Naval District, Mr. Chairman.

We have, as a matter of fact, a very good guide line on what this building itself will cost in that we have just taken bids on a similar building and we awarded a contract on the 31st of May of this year for $1,227,000.

Bear in mind that that does not include collateral equipment, that is the figure I have just quoted does not include collateral equipment, and neither does it include extension of utilities.

Mr. Sheppard. I see there is a portion of this preparation considered as reimbursable. Is that correct?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir. That is simply within the Navy. The commander of the Amphibious Training Command reimburses the commander of the amphibious base. That is for local accounting.

They should not put that here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Simply for convenience?
Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?
Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.
Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen.

FLEET AIR DEFENSE TRAINING CENTER, DAM NECK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will go to the next item, Naval Guided Missiles School at Dam Neck, Va. You have an item for a guided missiles school at a cost of $1,682,000 and a second item for a barracks for guided missiles school at a cost of $260,000, both projects totaling $1,942,000.

At this installation the plant value is $12,624,945; funded construction not in the plant value is $709,849; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $1,942,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $1,942,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $2,230,000.

Gentlemen, make your presentations justifying that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. The guided missiles school is part of the air defense training center at Dam Neck, sir. All elements of the naval air defense systems are operated for the training of both Regular and Reserve personnel. We have only a small student load at the present time but as soon as we have the facilities we expect to increase it to about fourfold in the next few years, at which time we will have about 50 officers and 450 men students under training at one time.

This will fulfill an urgent requirement, first, for the guided-missile school building for which we are asking $1,682,000; and, second, a barracks to house the students, $260,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Interpret the language for me here reflected on page 2 under F, item 1, guided-missiles school.

Admiral CLARK. I have it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. "Transportation and reinstallation of technical equipment now at Pomona, Calif., and Dam Neck, Va."

Admiral CLARK. Some of the technical equipment to be used in this school is now at Pomona, or at other localities at Dam Neck in temporary buildings.

We must transport this equipment which is expensive, electronics equipment, and put it in this building when it is completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean you will store it there?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. We are going to put it in so that we can use that equipment, which includes, very often, things such as computers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are consolidating activities at Dam Neck, Va.?

Admiral CLARK. Part of them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why are you doing that?

Captain RIDER. At the present time, sir, we have two installations, an interim school at Dam Neck, which is a very small school, and also we have one at Pomona, Calif., which furnishes training on one specific type missile.

It is now planned to build a school that will incorporate all the training functions and bring in portions from Pomona and put it down at Dam Neck.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was Pomona being done under contractual procedure?

Captain RIDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering story on this, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. Both of the items included in this request for this station were advance planned by Clark, Buhr, and Nexsen, of Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $8,900.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill., where you are making request for barracks and subsistence building in the amount of $3,992,000 and conversion building 28 for communications school at a cost of $346,000, enlarged bachelor officers' quarters at $1,518,000.

You have also added an item here of family housing at a cost of $3,700,800, making a total request of $9,556,800.

At this installation the plant value is $50,584,888; funded construction not in the plant value, $5,595,000; existing unfunded authorization, $1,664,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $8,038,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $9,556,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, $100,364,000.

Will you proceed to present your justification for the first item?

Admiral CLARK. The first item, sir, is part of the program of concentrating schools in the Great Lakes area. The existing 4,000 barracks spaces assigned to service schools are of temporary World War II design for emergency utilization by recruits. These barracks are grossly substandard and crowded, thereby creating morale and health problems. Plans call for 6,915 students and a staff of 757. This item is the first increment of 2,000 spaces in the planned replacement of substandard quarters and augmentation of barracks facilities. We expect economies to result by reducing the overhead by having a smaller number of schools and increasing the size of the schools at Great Lakes.

We also expect economies to result because a large part of the input of these schools is from the recruit training center itself, so we do not have to transport the recruits from the training center to the school and then to the fleet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are my conclusions correct relative to the personnel aspect of your presentation, to wit, that your officer plan results in a total of 949, your enlisted is planned at 5,165, civilians 810, officers 371?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And in the Reserve capacity you have 2 weeks of active training duty for 90 and planned 90. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does your other project, to wit, that of the conversion building, convert portion of building 2–B to interior communications? Is that connected with this?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. It is connected with the buildup of the school operation in this area.

The interior communication electricians, basic school, at this activity and the advanced school at the receiving station, Washington, D. C., are housed in substandard facilities. This item provides for the modification of an existing vacant permanent structure to furnish adequate space for these schools at a fraction of the cost of new construction and will permit joint use and thus effect economies and improve the quality of training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that also true of the BOQ?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. There are 78 permanent and 67 temporary spaces at this activity to house a total of 357 male officers in bachelor status. Firm plans indicate that this number will increase to 643. This item is the first increment toward providing additional quarters to satisfy the above requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would happen if you dropped one of the increments out of the total presentation here?

Admiral CLARK. Well, we would lose money, sir, because we would have a partially completed facility, and we would have to continue some of these operations. We would have to continue to have two staffs or perhaps three staffs at the school.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you would create a chaotic situation and you might just as well not have this entire thing. Isn't that about true?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering factors involved in this situation, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. With respect to item 1, that is the barracks building, the advance planning was performed by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Chicago, Ill., at a cost of $8,000.

With regard to item 2, advance planning was performed by Olsen & Urbain, Chicago, Ill., at a cost of $3,000.

The advance planning for item No. 3, that is the addition to the bachelor officers' quarters, was performed by Fugard, Olsen, Urban & Vlader, Chicago, Ill., at a cost of $11,250.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about family housing? Same status as those heretofore?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

NAVAL SCHOOL, EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL, NAVAL POWDER FACTORY, INDIAN HEAD, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected in the justification, Naval Powder Factory at Indian Head, Md., bachelor officers' quarters with mess, where you are asking for $780,000.

At this installation, the plant value is $294,304; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $780,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $780,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $1,936,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Present your justification for the requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. The Navy recently has been given the task of conducting instruction for all the armed services in the methods and

procedures for the recovery, evaluation, and disposal of both surface and underwater explosive ordnance employed by the United States and other nations.

This is being conducted at a school at Indian Head, and the large number of officer students and students that results overcrowd the facilities that are there.

You will note, sir, under the personnel data that we expect to go from 88 to 100 officer-students and in enlisted students from 155 to 243.

This will take care of the officers. Actually we do not have sufficient bachelor officer quarter accommodations for the officers who are going to school there now. They are double bunked and are living in cinderblock converted warehouses and other miscellaneous buildings which were not built as quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering situation pertaining to this project, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning was performed by Mills, Petticord & Mills, Washington, D. C., at a cost of $6,975.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Not at this time.

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, Calif., subsistence building," where you are asking for $119,000. It is reflected on page C7–8 of your justification breakdown.

At this installation the plant value is $4,564,315; funded construction not in the plant value is $9,670,263; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $119,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $119,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $10,853,000.

Proceed to present your justifications for this requirement.

Admiral CLARK. The present facilities are located on two floor levels in an old wood-frame building which was an annex of an old hotel.

The meat-refrigeration box, the butcher shop, vegetable iceboxes, and bulk stores are located on one floor, while the galley, messhall, and vegetable-preparation rooms are on the second floor.

There is no access except by an old freight elevator, approximately 40 years old.

The layout on both floors is so inappropriate and inefficient as to make it almost impossible to serve hot appetizing food, and we have food wastage because of the layout.

We would like to construct a 250-man subsistence building for which we are requesting $119,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have a present personnel strength there and officer personnel of 106. Your planned projection is 108, enlisted is 260, planned remains the same, the civilian is 359, and you show an increase to 371.

Your students number 854, and contemplated or planned are 955. Why do you need the increase between the 359 and 371 in the civilian category?

Admiral CLARK. With the student load going up we will require additional civilian employees to handle the workload.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering situation pertaining to this project, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. The advance planning for this project was performed by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, San Francisco, Calif., at a cost of $2,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does this $90,000 represent the total cost?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL RECEIVING STATION, NAVAL BASE, PHILADELPHIA COUNTY, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected as being the Naval Receiving Station, Naval Base, Philadelphia County, Pa., wherein you are asking for $1,428,000 for bachelor officers' quarters for 200 officers, with mess.

At this installation the plant is $3,311,002; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $1,428,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $1,428,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $608,000.

Will you make your presentation for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. The bachelor officers attached to the various commands in the Philadelphia area are quartered in an old building called the Baptist Institute, which was built in 1911 and is in a very undesirable area of town. Another group is housed in 8 rooms of an operations building on the naval auxiliary air station, where they have 17 bunks but they are not permanent bunks. They are really just for transient pilots.

There is actually a requirement in the Philadelphia area for quarters for 391 bachelor officers. Of these, 163 are permanently assigned, 150 are students, and 78 are officers who must temporarily leave ships.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you rent or own the building that you referred to as an old church building?

Admiral CLARK. The Baptist Institute is leased.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much you you pay per year?

Admiral CLARK. $37,000 a year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many years have you been leasing that building?

Captain RIDER. This is the second year or third year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The other building you referred to is an on-station building?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by officers of the district public works office of the Fourth Naval District.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is that figure 80,600?

Admiral PERRY. Square feet.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. 80,600 square feet in the entire building?

Admiral PERRY. Floor space, yes, sir. It will be a 5-story building.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How does this unit cost of $14.03 per square foot compare with what you are paying elsewhere?

Admiral PERRY. It is very comparable to the prices we have been getting in the Philadelphia area.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is to take care of 200 officers?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And that is all?

Admiral CLARK. We will be able to double bunk officers in case of peak loads, sir, in which case we could take care of more.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is a $1,428,000 building to take care of 200 officers; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir, but actually we will be able to take care of from 390 to 400.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What do you have now? You say it is in an undesirable part of town. What do you have?

Admiral CLARK. In the old Baptist Institute, sir?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where you are taking care of these officers now.

Admiral CLARK. It is in a leased building, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the matter with it?

Admiral CLARK. It is in an extremely undesirable part of town and the officers have to commute long distances to get to the yard.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How far?

Admiral CLARK. It is about 3 miles through town, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is there anything else wrong with the present location?

Admiral CLARK. The building is in poor condition. It was built in 1911.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What kind of a building is it?

Admiral CLARK. It is a brick building, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Can you take care of all 200 officers in this building?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many can you take care of in this building?

Admiral CLARK. In the Baptist Institute, 111, sir. Seventy-four live in the yard and the other officers have to find boarding houses or something in town.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you consider it a hardship to have to go 3 miles?

Admiral CLARK. I do for a large portion of these officers who are students going to school there.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have to do that in Washington, do you not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Naval Retraining Command, Portsmouth, N. H.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item reflected on page C7-10 of the justifications, Naval Retraining Command, Portsmouth, N. H., where you are asking for $42,000 for a fire escape tower.

At this installation the plant value is $3,371,000; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $42,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $42,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $870,000.

Will you make your presentation for that requirement, please?

Admiral Clark. We are asking for a fire escape tower in the naval retraining compound at Portsmouth, N. H., to permit men in one wing who cannot get out through an emergency exit to get out in a hurry in case of fire. This is a command where some of the men are confined, sir, and we want an escape tower which can be opened from the outside instead of the men having to go out through manually operated doors one at a time.

Mr. Sheppard. I would interpret from the language of the justifications, specifically addressing myself to the statement—

> This item provides for one additional escape tower with remote control locking and unlocking devices and replacement of manual devices in the existing tower with similar controls—

that you have one escape tower and are requesting another plus remote control locking and unlocking devices in both towers?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. This is a penal institution?

Admiral Clark. Yes.

Mr. Sheppard. And at present in case of fire the exit is not adequate to rapidly evacuate the men housed in the building?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. Admiral Perry, has this project been engineered?

Admiral Perry. Yes; this project was engineered by officers of the District Public Works Office of the 1st Naval District.

Mr. Sheppard. Any questions?

Mr. Andrews. How many prisoners are there at Portsmouth?

Admiral Clark. Right now there are 964.

Mr. Andrews. And you have 40 officers and 396 enlisted men?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. They are on station there, on duty there?

Admiral Clark. Yes; and in addition to guarding them as prisoners they undertake a retraining program of these people. That is why the personnel is high.

Mr. Andrews. Are these prisoners enlisted men?

Admiral Clark. Yes, they are enlisted men. These are the portions of our prisoners we feel may have a chance for rehabilitation.

Mr. Andrews. Are these prisoners officers and enlisted men or just enlisted men?

Admiral Clark. Just enlisted men. These officers try to retrain these people to try to make them useful military men or useful citizens.

Mr. Andrews. That is all.

FLEET SONAR SCHOOL, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item reflected at page C7–11 of the justifications, Fleet Sonar School, San Diego County, San Diego, Calif., wherein you are requesting $2,753,000 for a school building.

At this installation the plant value is $1,553,455; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $2,753,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $2,753,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $2,898,860.

Will you make your presentation for this requirement?

Admiral CLARK. The present sonar school is housed in 3 temporary, 2-story non-fire-resistant structures built during World War II as barracks. The limitations in space and restrictions on floor loading prevent the installation of necessary training equipment, and this replacement building is to permit us to conduct this school using the most modern equipment, some of which is heavy and large and cannot be fitted into the building presently existing, which itself is badly deteriorated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you anticipate maintaining your same officer strength, 63; and enlisted strength of 367 compared with 371 at present; the same civilian strength, 14; and you anticipate maintaining a student officer strength of 160 compared to 79 at present; and a student enlisted strength of 690 as compared to 339 at present.

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what are the engineering features connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Kistner, Wright & Wright of Los Angeles, Calif., at a cost of $16,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this improvement is considered essential to the training of the number of officers and students expected to be exposed to that type of training once the building is completed, is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What type of school is this?

Admiral CLARK. This is an antisubmarine warfare school.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A permanent setup?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You will have how many students there?

Admiral CLARK. About 850 total.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. 160 officers and 690 enlisted men?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. We have about 450 there now, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is a reinforced concrete building?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item which is listed as "School buildings, classified," in the amount of $1,243,000. This is reflected on page C7–12 of the justifications.

The location of these school buildings is not classified, but the utilization is classified and is not to be made a part of the record.

Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed with your presentation.

Admiral CLARK. This is off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my understanding from your statement that this is a school of universal military application?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Navy apparently is carrying the responsibility for the construction of the buildings and so forth. What, if any, contribution is being made to this school by other branches of the military?

Admiral CLARK. None, sir. The Joint Chiefs of Staff gave this task to the Navy and we are financing the whole thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering situation relating to this project?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Murphy & Locraft of Washington, D. C., at a cost of $6,975.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Looking at your personnel strength as reflected in the justifications, I notice that your present officer strength is listed as 39 and the planned officer strength is 36; enlisted is 72 at present, planned 62; civilian zero, planned zero; student officers 88 present, planned 100; student enlisted 155 present, planned 243. Is that all Navy personnel or is that to be split among the respective military services?

Admiral CLARK. That will include personnel of all services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do we find the Navy charged with the responsibility for carrying the excess load when the value of the school to the military services is of proportionate character?

Admiral CLARK. The type of weapons that we are studying at this school are largely Navy. If I may go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is a general function wherein a policy has been recently established that, where the function is predominantly Navy, the Navy will be the sponsor; and where the function is predominantly Army, the Army will be the sponsor, and so on; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

FLEET TRAINING CENTER, PEARL HARBOR, T. H.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now take up the next item, a fire-fighting school at the Fleet Training Center, Pearl Harbor, T. H., for which you are asking $44,000.

At this installation, the plant value is $1,004,005; funded construction not in the plant value is none; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed fiscal year 1956 authorization is $44,000; the proposed fiscal year 1956 appropriation is $44,000; and the estimated future appropriation required is $3,409,000.

This is a small amount of money but what is your justification for the requirement?

Admiral CLARK. This is for a fire-fighting school at Pearl Harbor. The present school is in a temporary building designed for a garage and warehouse which has been partially converted to accommodate two classrooms. The structure has been badly damaged by extensive termite infestation and dry rot. Because of the condition of the build-

ing, we should destroy it and transfer the equipment and material to a permanent building. We have inadequate schoolroom space. The student load requires 4,338 square feet and we are trying to operate in 1,280 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering situation relating to this project?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance planned by officers of the district public works office of the 14th Naval District.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Gentlemen, we thank you very much for your appearance before the committee and for your answers to the interrogation of members of the committee.

MEDICAL FACILITIES—Continental

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will now pick up the next item, "Medical facilities." Do we have those gentlemen present?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; we have. Admiral B. W. Hogan, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, is here, and also Capt. James B. Butler, Director of the Planning Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Admiral Hogan has a statement for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Hogan, we will be glad to have your statement.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Admiral HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, the objectives of the program under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the fiscal year 1956 public works program conform to criteria established by the Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget. Utilization and preservation of existing, good quality, temporary facilities will be continued to the maximum feasible extent; however, the correction of several minor inadequacies and deficiencies are necessary in certain temporary facilities in order to meet expanded workloads, correct soil erosion, and insure minimal operational capacity under emergency conditions. The construction of a permanent hospital is proposed at Great Lakes, Ill., as a replacement for obsolete, temporary facilities constructed during World War I and World War II and considered to be detrimental to patient welfare because of severe winter weather in that area.

Laboratory facilities for medical research are proposed at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. These will be provided by the conversion of one existing building and the construction of a new sound laboratory. It is considered paramount that medical research keep in pace with the development of new types of military craft and weapons which present continual new problems in human endurance and physiology.

New permanent facilities for the Armed Forces Medical Library are proposed at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., as a replacement for present inadequate and obsolete facilities.

Chapel facilities are proposed at the Naval Hospital, Guam, Marianas Islands, where no religious facilities currently exist.

In order to accomplish the foregoing objectives, appropriation in the amount of $2,841,700 is required. The items in this program are as follows:

1. An 800- to 1,500-bed permanent hospital at the United States Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., is required as a replacement for

obsolete, temporary facilities of World War I and World War II construction. This item is a part of a coordinated program developed through the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide permanent facilities for meeting the ultimate peacetime hospital bed requirements of the Navy and Marine Corps in the Great Lakes area. In keeping with policies of cross-utilization and coordinated medical services, hospital beds will also be provided for local Army and Air Force needs. $750,000 is requested in fiscal year 1956 to permit the development of architectural and engineering working plans only. Authorization and funding for the total amount required for construction, based on the data to be developed by the proposed architectural and engineering contract will be requested in the Navy public works program for fiscal year 1957.

2. The provision of emergency electrical power, at a cost of $60,000, is required for portions of the United States Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., not so equipped at the time of construction. These temporary ward buildings, constructed during World War II, are now utilized for the care of neuropsychiatric, medical and surgical patients. Uninterrupted electrical service to vital functions within these patient areas is considered to be mandatory for patient welfare and safety.

3. A serious soil-erosion problem exists at the United States Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Fla., where the St. John's River is rapidly destroying improved property by tidal and wave action. It is proposed to prevent further erosion by the construction of an 800-foot bulkhead along the riverbank at an estimated cost of $46,000.

4. A 200-seat, all-faith chapel, at a cost of $269,000, is requested for the United States Naval Hospital, Guam, Marianas Islands. No religious facilities were provided for the recently completed hospital and none are accessible to the hospital in its new location. The chapel will be of standard plan and will provide facilities for hospital patients, staff, military personnel and dependents at the hospital and in the adjacent areas, and will serve to correct, in part, the overall deficiency of religious facilities on the island of Guam.

5. Permanent medical research laboratory facilities are proposed for the Naval Medical Research Laboratory, Submarine Base, New London, Conn. The program for investigation of problems associated with shipboard and submarine medicine has been curtailed or hampered because of lack of facilities. The advent of newer types of weapons and naval craft has created problems in human stress, endurance, and physiology. Additional investigation is urgently required in order to aid man in keeping pace with the instruments of warfare. It is proposed to provide the most urgently required facilities by the conversion of an existing permanent building and the construction of a new sound laboratory at a total cost of $755,000 as an initial increment of a conversion plan at a total estimated cost of $1,044,000, to be completed later.

6. The Secretary of Defense has determined that permanent library facilities are urgently required for the Armed Forces Medical Library to replace existing overcrowded and inadequate facilities occupied since 1887. The responsibility for planning and budgeting for this new facility was assigned to the Secretary of the Navy. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery was further assigned the responsibility for sponsorship in the public works program. It is proposed to construct and operate the new library, which will incorporate features

for the protection of this invaluable collection of medical literature, on the grounds of the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. The $350,000 requested in fiscal year 1956 will permit the development of architectural and engineering working plans. Appropriation in the amount required for construction of this building will be requested in the fiscal year 1957 Navy public works program.

7. The provision of on-station family housing is proposed at three naval hospitals. At the United States Naval Hospital, Corona, Calif., the construction of 15 married enlisted men's quarters and the provision for 8 additional married officers' quarters are requested. The latter will be accomplished by the conversion of an existing building excess to the current needs of the hospital. At the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass., 15 married enlisted men's quarters are proposed to replace existing inadequate and deteriorated apartments, converted from World War I temporary wards. Ten sets of married officers' quarters are requested at the United States Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex. The above quarters will insure the around-the-clock coverage of these hospitals with medical specialists and technicians to meet recurring emergencies beyond the capabilities of customary duty section. The total estimated cost of the quarters requested is $611,700.

I shall be happy to furnish additional details on any of the above items that you may desire.

ARMED FORCES MEDICAL LIBRARY, NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER, BETHESDA, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the first item under "Medical facilities," which is an Armed Forces Medical Library proposed to be constructed at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., for which you are requesting $350,000.

At this installation the plant value is $16,583,167; funded construction not in the plant value, $726,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $350,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $350,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $21,000,000.

Present your justifications for that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. This is to provide a permanent, fire-resistant, concrete structure to house the valuable and irreplaceable collection of the Armed Forces Medical Library as a replacement for the existing overcrowded, obsolete and hazardous building, occupied since 1887. The present inadequate facilities necessitate a split operation and afford little protection of the collection against deterioration and loss by fire.

The Secretary of Defense has asken the Navy to sponsor this project although it will be a medical library for all the Armed Forces and will also be available, as at present, for other medical authorities all over the world.

This year we are asking for $350,000 for the architectural and engineering fees. The eventual cost of the project we estimate will be $6,369,000. We have Colonel Rogers here who can give you the details as to how this library operates, if you desire.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, please do.

Colonel ROGERS. The Armed Forces Medical Library has long since outgrown the quarters if now occupies, which were built in 1887. The quantities of literature amassed by the library has become so great that since 1942 we have had to move 30,000 books to rented space in Cleveland, Ohio. The current receipts average 15,000 monographs and 100,000 journal publications every year. At the present time we face a really desperate situation which can only be solved by the construction of a new building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the Navy's cost for the operation of the library as of the moment, with specific reference to the Navy, period?

Colonel ROGERS. This is now a joint library.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has it been joint over a period of time?

Colonel ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not an innovation?

Colonel ROGERS. No. It has served the 3 services for 75 years. It was renamed the Armed Forces Medical Library in 1952 and given a joint administration at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what is the engineering situation relating to this project?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance planned by the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you contemplate that you will have the plans completed?

Admiral PERRY. We should make the architectural awards November 1 of this year and the plans should be available within 12 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The library is now located in how many buildings?

Colonel ROGERS. In 3 buildings in Washington and 1 in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume when the new building is completed the library will all be confined under one roof?

Colonel ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

NAVAL HOSPITAL, CHELSEA, MASS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass., wherein you are requesting $192,800 for family housing. That is reflected on page CFH8–1 of the justifications.

At this installation the plant value is $8,672,165; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $192,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $192,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Proceed with your presentation for this requirement.

Admiral CLARK. These enlisted men's quarters are replacements for 15 units that are 38 years old. Because of the operational necessity for key enlisted personnel to reside on the station, the availability of community housing is not a factor. We feel these people must live aboard and we would like to replace these extremely old unsatisfactory buildings with permanent ones for those who must remain on the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, these people for whom you want to construct housing will continue to live on the station but you want them adequately housed?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice the unit cost is $12,850.

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what is the engineering situation relating to this project?

Admiral PERRY. The cost of this housing item is based on the DOD criteria as have been all the housing items presented in this proposal.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, CORONA, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval Hospital, Corona, Calif.," wherein you are requesting $256,800 for family housing for 4 senior officers, 4 junior officers, and 15 enlisted men.

At this installation the plant value is $11,036,683; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $256,800; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $256,800; and the estimated future appropriation required, $30,000.

Present the necessity for this request.

Admiral CLARK. This, sir, is to house the officers and enlisted men who must be on station at this hospital ready to meet emergency medical calls. They are now housed in a building which is going to revert to other uses. I believe Captain McFarland has the details.

Captain MCFARLAND. Eight additional MOQ's and fifteen additional MEMQ's are urgently required on the station for the efficient, 24-hour, 7-days-a-week operation of the hospital and to meet emergency medical requirements. Because of the operation necessity for doctors, medical specialists, and key enlisted personnel to reside on the station, the availability of community housing is not a factor. The hospital is located 4½ miles from the small rural community of Corona with no public transportation available. These units will be constructed on land already owned by the Government, and the MOQ's will be provided by conversion of an existing building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of conversion do you anticipate doing here under this request?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this will consist of the conversion of an existing unoccupied enlisted men's dormitory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What kind of building is it?

Admiral PERRY. The building is wood frame on concrete floor slab.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How old is that building?

Admiral PERRY. It is a wartime building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then it was considered temporary at the time of construction?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; it was.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the additional cost from an engineering point of view to build new quarters as compared to making apartments out of a temporary structure?

Admiral PERRY. The advance planning has been done by the officers of the District Public Works Office of the Eleventh Naval District. The cost of conversion for each of the apartments to be occupied by senior officers will be $9,000, and for the junior officers, $7,000. If we used the DOD criteria, the cost of those quarters would be——

Captain MCFARLAND. $141,800.

Admiral PERRY. What would they be individually?

Captain MCFARLAND. $20,250 for the senior officers and $15,200 for the junior officers.

Admiral PERRY. In other words, approximately two times as much.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the contemplated figure of maintenance that will be necessary on a yearly basis after you have done this conversion?

Admiral PERRY. I do not have that before me.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the normal percentage?

Admiral PERRY. I would estimate 5 percent maintenance alone not operation.

Admiral CLARK. I think actually this was a permanent building at one time.

Captain BUTLER. Yes. This was constructed as a part of the TB unit. It has the Spanish-type tile.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know the buildings and that is what prompted my question. I may not have the same buildings in mind, but there were certain buildings there that if you considered conversion of them I would question the wisdom of the conversion, but from the testimony given perhaps we are not talking about the same ones.

Admiral PERRY. I say it is temporary because I consider any wood frame building of temporary character. This is wood frame on a concrete floor slab.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth, we are considering the housing requirement at the naval hospital, Corona, Calif. This is under "Medical facilities." They are asking for the conversion of a building to provide quarters for 4 senior officers and 4 junior officers to the extent of $64,000, and 15 enlisted men's quarters, for a total of $192,800. Do you have any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. 23 units for $256,800?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, naval hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex., reflected at page CFH8–3 of the justifications, wherein you request $162,100 for family housing for 2 senior officers and 8 junior officers.

At this installation the plant value is $3,339,979; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $162,100; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $162,100; and the estimated future appropriation required, $27,000.

You will present your justifications for the requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. We are requesting these 10 quarters, sir, for key personnel in order to keep on station officers who may be called to the hospital on off-duty hours to meet emergency calls. These quarters will be built on station on land owned by the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, what is the engineering situation connected with this item?

Admiral PERRY. There has been no advance planning engineering on this project. The estimates were established by criteria from the Department of Defense.

Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the next item, naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., where you are asking for a permanent 800-bed hospital on a 1,500-bed chassis for which you are requesting in fiscal year 1956, $750,000.

At this installation the plant value is $8,804,511; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $750,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $750,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $17,500,000.

Will you make your presentation, for that requirement, please?

Admiral Clark. We are requesting $750,000.

Mr. Sheppard. This is A. and E. money?

Admiral Clark. A. and E. money for a new permanent hospital containing patient treatment, clinical, subsistence and other necessary ancillary facilities as a replacement for obsolete and scattered temporary wartime construction. Existing permanent structures will be integrated into the total plan in their present capacities. The new facilities will eliminate present hazards associated with transporting patients between scattered facilities, especially during severe winter weather.

We expect to take care of a military population of 91,400, of which 35,875 are Navy, 4,850 are Army, 12,600 are Air Force, and 38,000 dependents.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, your A. and E. money is for the purpose of drawing up the plans and blueprints and so forth?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. And your estimated future appropriation requests will be $17,500,000?

Admiral Clark. $13,480,000.

Mr. Sheppard. I see here $17,500.000.

Admiral Clark. The estimated cost of this hospital is $13,480,000.

Mr. Sheppard. Admiral Perry, when do you anticipate that this A. and E. money will be expended and the data necessary for contracting available?

Admiral Perry. February 15, 1956, assuming we receive the money on the 1st of July, which we have not, so it will slip beyond February 15, 1956, by the difference between July 1 and the time we actually receive the money.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, practically all the projects we have referred to so far will be predicated on (1) whether Congress appropriates the funds, and (2) whether the allocating authorities allocate the funds according to the justifications presented to the Congress.

Admiral Perry. That is correct up to a point.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the deviation?

Admiral Perry. The time you have to go through for allocation of funds is sometimes somewhat delayed, particularly in regard to hospital designs and hospital construction.

Mr. Sheppard. That is an interesting comment coming from you, Admiral Perry, because I have heard from sources other than yourself and your associates that you had done a remarkable job of getting your allocated money out.

Admiral PERRY. If we get the money allocated we have no trouble getting it obligated if we have the criteria, which we will have in this instance. But we sometimes have trouble getting the allocation to us after Congress has appropriated the funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is what I understand.

Admiral Perry, what is the engineering situation on this project?

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning for this project was performed by Schmidt, Garden & Erickson of Chicago, Ill., at a cost of $80,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice you estimate $25 a square foot for this construction. How does that compare with other hospital construction?

Admiral PERRY. It compares very favorably with actual bids that have been received for hospital construction in the past and it conforms with the figures which the Bureau of the Budget has received and which they have approved for us.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is to take care of how many people? It is an 800-bed hospital?

Admiral CLARK. It is to take care of a total population of 91,400. When I say population I mean elegible for hospitalization.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that Army, Navy, and Air Force?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, and their dependents.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the present population?

Admiral CLARK. The estimated population at present is 72,681.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are they all being taken care of in these frame wards that you told us about?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. One of the buildings is a permanent building. It contains the obstetrical ward. I had the shock of seeing where they put the babies so close together the nurse can hardly reach over and get hold of them. But all the ward buildings are spread out in these temporary structures.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are you stating, then, that there is no other hospital, Army, Navy, Air Force, Veterans' Administration, or otherwise, within a reasonable distance that could be utilized?

Admiral CLARK. I would like to have Captain Butler of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery answer that.

Captain BUTLER. Yes, sir. That question has also been investigated thoroughly by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I ask because we know of instances where it is proposed to close a hospital, and yet it would seem, when the picture is looked into as though the hospital might very well serve military needs if the military were willing to travel a few miles to utilize it. And I want your assurance to this committee that the ground has been thoroughly canvassed and there is no other available facility.

Admiral CLARK. It has been thoroughly canvassed over 3 or 4 years.

Admiral HOGAN. This is now a jointly utilized hospital. At the present time there are Navy and Marine Corps personnel, 237; Army, 261; Air Force, 33. It serves military personnel and also serves the Middle West area.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. But there is no other building or facility within reasonable reach of this location that could serve as a replacement for the hospital that you tell us is now inadequate?

Admiral HOGAN. No hospital in operation today.

NAVAL HOSPITAL, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.," bulkhead along riverbank, for which you are asking $46,000.

At this installation the plant value is $3,598,815; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $46,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $46,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed and present the justification for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. This item is to construct an 800-foot bulkhead along the St. Johns River bank to prevent further loss of improved Government property due to erosion. The river is eroding away the bank. The present rate of erosion endangers the wiring and trees along the river bank where the quarters are located. We believe this expenditure will save us money and prevent major inconvenience if authorized at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, has this been engineered?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; it has. Advance planning was performed by the Office of the District Public Works Officer of the 6th Naval District, Charleston, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At this particular location, you have already lost a 25-foot strip by erosion. If the 800-foot bulkhead is put in; will it stop that erosion?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; it will.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There will be no question about the technique as as far as that is concerned and the end result will be accomplished?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir.

NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, UNITED STATES NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the Naval Medical Research Laboratory at the United States Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., facilities for medical research laboratory, wherein you are asking for $755,000.

At this installation the plant value is included in the submarine base amount of $23,008,622: funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $755,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $755,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $289,000.

Proceed and present the justifications for this requirement and the necessity for the request.

Admiral CLARK. This item is to convert one barracks building and construct a new sound laboratory to provide urgently needed space for medical research in problems associated with shipboard, diving, and submarine medicine. Additional research in human physiology and tolerance is urgently required in connection with

nuclear submarine. Spaces currently available are crowded and inadequate in size and design and consist of temporary barracks buildings, used only as a matter of expediency to meet expanding needs of the laboratory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where else do you have activities of a parallel character?

Admiral CLARK. Nowhere.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, there is no other place you can go and receive the benefit of the training desired under the presentation you are making; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct. Of course, being a submarine base, that is the ideal place to conduct research.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note your officer complement, present and planned, is 12; enlisted, present 29, planned 28; civilian, present, 49, planned, 61; student, present, 5, planned, 29.

As to the civilian category, why the increase of civilians and for what purpose are you going to use them?

Admiral CLARK. Those figures are for the base as a whole. I am not sure that the Medical Department intends to take on any more; they expect to do it with the present work force. I would have to supply the other for the committee. I am not sure just what the submarine base contemplates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique pertaining to this project?

Admiral PERRY. This project has been advance-planned by Skidmore, Owen & Merrill, of New York City, at a cost of $7,500.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why $66.40 a square foot?

Admiral PERRY. Because of the particular type of building.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the type?

Admiral PERRY. It will be concrete foundation on rock, brick walls without windows, poured gypsum roof slab. Special interior finishes for sound testing will require specialized engineering services. An echoic chamber and submarine psychoacoustic research room will have fiberglass wedges all surfaces, stretched-wire floor suspended 4 inches above subfloor, and so forth, to achieve attenuation (reduction) of an ambient (surrounding) noise level of at least 90 decibels with 95 percent sound absorption. Recording laboratory to be plaster polycylindrical shape and hung ceiling also polycylindrical. Electrophysiological recording to have electric shielding to achieve 100 decibels electrical attenuation. All other rooms to have attenuation of ambient noise level of at least 90 decibels, completely air-conditioned.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What do you mean by sound shielding?

Admiral PERRY. It is really a soundproof building, Mr. Wigglesworth. They test for sound within this building itself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They test for sound?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; the height of sound and the effect of sound upon people that are put in there. I think you had better get the doctor to answer you on that.

Captain BUTLER. This is research in sound, Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The effects of sound on the human being?

Captain BUTLER. The effects of sound on the human being; yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I ask along the same line: This is medical research, is it not?

Captain BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And it deals specifically with atomic and submarine research?

Captain BUTLER. Yes, sir; that is part of it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Problems that might be related thereto?

Captain BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, the determinations that are arrived at are not necessarily confined to the functions of the submarine exclusively; it could be applied elsewhere where they do have the effects of sound and its interference with the mental capacity?

Captain BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So it does have its contributing factors to other issues of sound effects, even though it is being restricted for that?

Admiral HOGAN. Yes, sir. This is only one part of the research project there that is planned, the effect of noises, for instance, on crews to the point where they destroy the ability to hear noises. Of course, this research there can be transferred to noises from jet engines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this somewhat of an innovation in your field of research?

Admiral HOGAN. We are doing this research now, but they have not had the proper laboratory, really, to get the best results.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It occurs to me this could contribute considerably to another aspect of military problems. In other words, I understand from the medical profession they are having a lot of difficulty where the population is too close to the high-revved-up jet operation, because where you have a high-velocity noise it is transferred to the individual and some react extremely adverse and some not so badly.

Admiral HOGAN. The final results of damage done by these noises on the ear and how they would apply to the civilian population as well as Navy personnel living under those conditions.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I ask for clarification, under item 1, "Facilities for medical research laboratory," subitem b, "Remodel building No. 141," under that subheading it calls for "Expand basement. New penthouse."

I think we ought to have a definition of what you mean by penthouse in connection with the laboratory.

Captain BUTLER. I believe penthouse is proper wherever they put in air conditioning.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You mean you have to have a penthouse to put the air conditioning in?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. You have to put air conditioning in here and, in order to provide room for the air conditioning equipment, it has to be on the roof. Therefore, we have to make a new roof and put what we call an air-conditioning penthouse up there, just like you have a penthouse for motors, and so forth, to run elevators.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is a penthouse but not necessarily for recreational purposes.

Admiral PERRY. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is what I was trying to get clear on the record. It is not a penthouse in the ordinary sense of the word as interpreted by the lay mind, that a penthouse is a nice comfortable room or apartment on the roof of a building?

Admiral PERRY. I do not imagine this room would be very comfortable with the machinery in there.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Sheppard. Pick up the next item "Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., standby emergency power" where you are asking for $60,000.

At this installation the plant value is $8,874,034; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $60,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $60,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $7,372,000.

Proceed and make your presentation for that requirement.

Admiral Clark. This is for the installation of two 50-kilovolt-ampere diesel generator units in the east substation at the hospital, and two 75-kilovolt-ampere diesel generator units at the west substation, and to construct a lean-to building to house the equipment and switching gear. That particular hospital has some emergency standby power, but it has not for some of the important wards and areas where they should have standby power in case of failure.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, this is beefing up your standby power requirements?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. What are the engineer features?

Admiral Perry. This project was advance planned by the office of the district public works officer, of the Fourth Naval District, Philadelphia, Pa.

Medical Facilities—Overseas

Mr. Sheppard. The next is "Medical facilities—overseas." This is not classified, is it?

Admiral Clark. No, sir.

Naval Hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands

Mr. Sheppard. I call your attention to the "Naval Hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands," wherein you are asking for $269,000 for a chapel of 200 seats.

I note at this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, $17,525,380, existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $269,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $269,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $1,297,000.

Make your presentation for this requirement, please.

Admiral Clark. This is for the construction of a permanent 200-seat all-faith chapel to provide suitable religious facilities for the hospital patients and staff and military and civilian populations in adjacent areas. There are 2,606 people who will be served by this chapel. They are presently using a quonset hut, which is insufficient in size and has deteriorated because of the damp climate and typhoons that regularly strike Guam.

Mr. Sheppard. I see under "b" "Site development, roads, walks, and utilities" a lump sum of $34,300. I assume from that that you are either putting in new roads or improving roads already there.

Admiral PERRY. Generally speaking, the roads will be merely a realining of the roads in order to fit them around the new building after it is built. It will not be a new system of roads.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features applied to this item?

Admiral PERRY. This was advance planned by the area public works officer at Guam, Midway Islands.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is to be used as a chapel for all religious faiths?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the size of this hospital on Guam?

Admiral HOGAN. This is a brandnew hospital, completed last fall of 300 beds.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many other hospitals are over there?

Admiral HOGAN. This is the only hospital servicing the three services. There is another hospital on the island run by the Guam trustees of the island.

Mr. ANDREWS. But the Navy has the mission to supply hospital facilities for all three services on that island?

Admiral HOGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. And you say no other service has a hospital there.

Admiral HOGAN. Yes, sir. They have no facilities there for hospital care.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where are the 2,606 people to be served by this chapel?

Admiral CLARK. They are in the near vicinity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In other words, this chapel is not to be exclusively for the hospital?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct; it is for the military population on the island of Guam.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is no other chapel there now other than the quonset hut?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This unit cost of $29.71 per square foot is the figure laid down, generally speaking, for chapels by the Secretary of Defense?

Admiral CLARK. I think there is a cost factor involved of the location.

Admiral PERRY. There is a cost factor of 2, which would make the cost of a similar structure within the continental confines of the United States $14.85 per square foot, which is well within the criteria laid down by DOD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is about double the cost per square foot in the United States.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that true of all construction in Guam?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. We have quite a military operation on Guam, have we not?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Thousands of ground troops of the Army?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; we have not thousands of ground troops on Guam. We estimate we will be taking care of a population of 2,606 people and that includes dependents.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Both civilian and military?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; as long as the civilians are connected—wives and children of the military.

Mr. OSTERTAG. American wives and children of the military?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And that constitutes a total military operation personnel on the island of Guam?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir; it does not. Captain Butler can expand on that.

Captain BUTLER. This chapel is to provide religious services for a section of Guam, about one-third, in an area of this population. Eventually the Chaplain Corps plans to have about 3 chapels on Guam, 1 at the other end of the island and 1 in another area of personnel concentration. This is the first one of the 3 chapels they will have to replace a number of quonset hut chapels, I think probably 4 or 5 or half a dozen.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What I am trying to get at is the size of our military establishment on Guam and then the Navy's responsibility thereto. I am trying to determine the over-all picture and where your responsibilities are in connection with it. When I visited the Island of Guam some two or three years ago, and if I recall correctly, I visited a hospital there.

Admiral CLARK. I would have to get you for the record the total military population. I think perhaps where the questioning got off on a different aspect was Admiral Hogan was addressing himself to Mr. Andrews in talking about what the chapel served and this is not necessarily serving the hospital itself. What Captain Butler said is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am merely trying to get the picture as to Navy's responsibility on the island of Guam and the total overall personnel picture of the services.

Admiral CLARK. I do not have those figures with me. I think it is about 18,000 military people on the whole island.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And the Navy is solely responsible for the personnel there, including providing chapels?

Admiral CLARK. I would have to check whether the Air Force is providing a chapel for their faiths, or not. I do not have that information.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The impression was left here a few moments ago that the Navy was responsible——

Admiral CLARK. For the hospitals; for the medical services.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I know, but we have already separated the hospital and the chapel as to personnel requirements and services, have we not?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir, I do not think we have; because when I answered the Navy was responsible, I was addressing Mr. Andrews in saying we are responsible for the hospitals. I do not believe we are responsible for all the religious welfare for all three services; I think they have divided it into areas and for this area where there are largely naval personnel, plus Army people who are hospitalized and Air Force people who are hospitalized, we want to take care of that local population. We are not responsible for those people when they leave the hospital, as to whether they go to church the week after. If they go back to the SAC base, they may go to their Air Force chapel. But from a survey that has been made of this part of

the island of Guam where the hospital happens to be located, we have a requirement as computed by the chaplain of providing religious services to a total of 2,606 military people. Some of those people are in the hospital and they may be either Army, Navy, or Air Force.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And they may be outside of the hospital?

Admiral CLARK. And they may be dependents of those people. And if there are any natives, we certainly would permit them to go, although the most of them attend the island churches, and the Department of Interior is responsible for the government of Guam—that is, for the native population.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Actually here you have a request for funds to construct a chapel which is going to be adjacent and associated with the hospital. There is nothing here to indicate whether there are hundreds of chapels, or no chapels on the island of Guam and what the requirements are for this chapel. Your justification merely says, in substance, you hope to serve some 2,600 people, but not how many other chapels might still be serving that same number of people.

Admiral CLARK. There are several chapels, all in quonset huts, but there are no permanent chapels on Guam under the military. This is a replacement of a quonset hut with a permanent chapel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there were other chapels there, this presentation would obviously fall within the category of the Air Force and I presume would be reflected in their public works section.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Hogan, I want to thank you and your assistants for your attendance and the responses to the interrogations of the committee.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES—CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item entitled "Communication Facilities—Continental" wherein I find a request for a naval radio station at Northwest, Va.—radio direction finder facility, $436,000.

Will you proceed with your justification of this requirement, please?

Admiral, you have a very short statement to present to the committee?

GENERAL STATEMENT

Admiral BRUTON. Yes, sir.

1. The naval communication public works program for fiscal year 1956 requires appropriations in the amount of $28,382,800 for 8 projects of which 1 is in the continental United States, 2 are in a United States territory and 5 are in foreign countries.

2. The projects for which appropriations are requested are of such essentiality to the required augmentation and improvement of the naval communication system as to require action in the fiscal year 1956 public works program. They have been developed in consonance with all criteria for public works projects and have been planned and designed to meet two specific program objectives:

A. The first objective is the required expansion or augmentation of the naval communication system necessary to meet the communication support required by the naval operating forces. All but $1 million of the requested amount is programed against this objective. Three projects in this expansion and augmentation program, as fol-

lows, are required to relieve communication deficiencies caused by the expanding commitments of the operating forces and the development of new concepts of operation:

(2) Construction of facilities designed to provide communications to the eastern Mediterranean area, where facilities are now either nonexistent or inadequate;

(*b*) Improvement of communication capabilities in the Alaskan area to meet continental defense program requirements;

(*c*) Purchase of long-lead time equipment for a new powerful very low-frequency transmitter station in the Northeast Atlantic to provide reliable communication to submarines operating in Atlantic areas. The remaining projects are to provide housing and community support facilities at stations operationally complete or under construction in the Philippines, Japan, and North Africa.

B. A second program objective for naval communications is that of providing incidental facilities in support of the antisubmarine warfare program. Appropriations in the amount of $1 million are being requested under this category to provide new direction finder facilities at the Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, and to construct new buildings to house new and modern direction finder equipment and to provide incidental utilities at existing communication stations in Adak and Japan. This new equipment, purchased with annual appropriations, is to replace outmoded World War II direction finders, and is an essential link in providing necessary capability in the antisubmarine warfare program. The phasing of this construction has been matched to equipment delivery dates.

Naval Radio Station, Northwest, Va.

Mr. Sheppard. Now pick up the detailed request for the naval radio station at Northwest, Va., wherein you are asking for $436,000 for a radio direction finder facility.

At this installation the plant value is $4 million; funded construction not in plant value, $100,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $436,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $436,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Admiral Clark. This provides for the construction of a complete high-frequency direction finder facility in completion of stations in the Atlantic of a high-frequency direction finder nature. It will replace the obsolete and worn out high-frequency direction finder facility with a modern facility and is necessary to place the Navy in a position for classified operations essential to national defense. The new facility is to be constructed on Government land at the site of an existing radio station.

Mr. Sheppard. I see the personnel strength is reflected as present, officer, none; planned, 1; enlisted personnel, present, none; planned, 20; civilian, present, none; planned, none. In other words, you will have a total of 21 military personnel on that station when it is completed; is that correct?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. And it is my understanding from your statement that it is to provide another integral part of this type of communication; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature situation connected with this issue?

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning for this project was performed by Marcellas Wright & Son of Richmond, Va., at a cost of $6,200.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As far as your housekeeping requirements reflect the devices, they are based on your shopping list and past experience; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I take it there is no land acquisition involved in this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; it is all Government owned.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And it is being constructed on the already owned 4,700 acres.

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is this just land that you have available for this use, or was it acquired in anticipation of this development? What is the history in connection with this site?

Captain RUFF. It was acquired with a view of eventually installing this particular facility.

Mr. OSTERTAG. When was it acquired?

Admiral BRUTON. This large tract of land was acquired primarily to build a high-frequency naval receiver station in Northwest, Va. It is about 20 miles from Norfolk. Of course this high-frequency direction finder will only occupy a very small part of this large tract. The primary purpose was for a receiver station with outside antennas, and so forth. We are going to use part of it for this high-frequency direction finder which is also a receiving facility.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, this 4,700 acres you acquired some few years ago and not necessarily for this project entirely?

Admiral BRUTON. No; only a small part of it for this project.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If we own the land and it is to be at the site of an existing station, why do you need $262,000 for site preparation, utilities, roads and services?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, this high-frequency direction finder facility which you are justifying here is going to require additional improvements along the line of utilities and roads to the particular site or location of this development? Am I correct in that assumption?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And the 290 acres is the approximate amount of area that will be used in that connection?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Rather than the 4,700 listed in the justifications.

Admiral BRUTON. That is correct.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES—OVERSEAS

NAVAL COMUNICATIONS STATION, ADAK, ALASKA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the first item under "Communication facilities, overseas," reflected there under "Naval Communications Station, Adak, Alaska," radio direction finder facility, wherein you are asking $439,000.

At this installation the plant value is $13,875,000; funded construction not in plant value, $150,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $439,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $439,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Make your presentation for that requirement, please. In the first place, I want to know is this part of a total operation that is in an expansion program procedure, or is this an individual concept that we are making to these respective stations?

Admiral CLARK. This is part of a worldwide program that is expanding. We have under procurement new and improved direction-finder equipment for installation in the various direction-finder stations. The equipment will be available on the 1st of January 1956.

At this present station at Adak, the old equipment is now housed in a frame shack with a floor area of 1,320 square feet and it is subjected to flooding in heavy rains. The new equipment requires 2,200 square feet and, of course, should be weathertight, so that the electronic equipment contained therein will not be made inoperable by the weather.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it generally considered that stations of this character are preferably established in obscure places, away from population to the degree possible?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir, in order to avoid electronic interference.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To avoid interference both electrical and otherwise?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you are carrying a rather consistent small personnel in connection with stations reviewed so far. I notice here you show officer personnel, present, 1; planned, 1; enlisted personnel, present, 21; planned, 20 and zero, zero for civilians.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And, as you previously stated, this is part of a chain operation?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And is considered an absolute necessity if chain communication is to be completed in its entirety and become efficient accordingly; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the engineering features pertaining to this item?

Admiral PERRY. In connection with this item, the advance planning was performed by the office of the district public works officer of the 17th Naval District, Kodiak, Alaska.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions upon this item?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What do you mean by technical collateral installation?

Admiral PERRY. That is the installation of a special equipment which must go into the facility itself. I think Admiral Bruton could probably expand on that more than I. I do not know exactly what collateral equipment is.

Admiral BRUTON. That is the installation of the electronic equipment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The cost per square foot is $68.18 for the D. F. building and $60.50 for the emergency power building. How do those compare with other Alaska construction?

Admiral PERRY. They are exactly in line with what our experience has been in connection with construction at Adak. Adak is a very isolated place and in order to get anything constructed up there the contractor must bid high, because he sends his men up there; he has to assure the men will have overtime work on this work and if it rains and they cannot work, his payroll still goes on. He has to house and feed them. As a consequence, experience has shown our cost factor there is an average cost factor of 3.0. It costs three times as much as to do similar work in the United States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you have difficulty in finding contractors, or do you negotiate?

Admiral PERRY. This is not done on a negotiated basis. We take bids on work up there and, peculiar to say, we get competition in bidding and generally from contractors in the northwest area of the United States, although sometimes contractors from San Francisco bid on work.

NAVAL RADIO FACILITY, KAMI SEYA, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item "Naval radio facility, Kami Seya, Japan," wherein you are asking for a total of $2,564,700, comprised of a radio direction-finder facility in the amount of $125,000, and family housing for 3 senior officers, 30 junior officers, and 118 enlisted personnel in the amount of $2,439,700.

At this installation the plant value is $4,510,393; funded construction not in plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $125,000;[1] the proposed 1956 appropriation, $125,000;[1] and the estimated future appropriation required, none.[2]

Present your justifications for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is another item for the construction of a direction-finder building and the installation of electronic equipment in the building. The present direction-finder functions are being carried out in a mobile temporary shelter which was provided to house makeshift obsolete World War II direction-finder equipment.

This is part of the same program you just mentioned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is just as essential to the program as the ones we have previously inquired into?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have reflected here personnel strength, officer, present, 2; planned, 5; enlisted, present, 39; planned, 52; civilian, zero, zero.

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a small complement but is in accordance with the requirements, I presume, of an operation of this character?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. Advance planning for this project was performed by the officer in charge of construction of MOY contracts, at Okuska, Japan.

Mr SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

---

[1] $2,439,700 for housing not included.
[2] $4,098,600 for housing not included.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, in this Japan project, as in the Alaska project, I would like to know whether or not this serves just the naval facilities. I mean by that ships, or aircraft.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up "Family housing" for 3 senior officers and 30 junior officers and 118 enlisted personnel, to the extent of $2,439,700.

Explain your requirement for that, please.

Admiral CLARK. There is no onstation housing at this remote facility and a survey conducted under coordination of the commander in chief, Far East, indicates there are only 16 offstation dwellings within a reasonable distance and these in turn are very much below American standards.

It is essential that the operation be fully operational under all conditions on a 24-hour basis and therefore we want more of our people to live aboard the station.

This is to provide family housing for those people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice your unit cost here is $17.20.

What is the engineering technique pertaining to this?

Admiral PERRY. The same answer applies to this particular project, Mr. Chairman, which applies to all of the housing projects in this proposed bill. The costs follow the DOD criteria.

In this particular instance, since the construction of this housing is in Japan, we have applied a factor of 1.2 to the stateside costs, because experience has shown that the cost of construction in Japan is that much more than the cost of similar construction in the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You mean it is two-tenths more?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, two-tenths more, Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This housing program is a component part of your expanded housing program and it is considered as essential as the housing programs you have heretofore presented to the committee. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, KODIAK, ALASKA

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up the next item, "Naval communication station, Kodiak, Alaska," wherein you ask for $6,991,000, and your total figure is made up of 15 subheads.

At this installation, the plant value is $10 million; funded construction not in the plant value, $40,000; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $6,991,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $6,991,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

I want you to make your presentation for this requirement. This has to do with communications, and I assume it is generally on the same premise as those in the communication requirements heretofore presented.

Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. It is generally the same, sir. We have an additional operational requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Which creates a larger appropriation request?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Admiral CLARK. Particularly since some of the facilities are located well out in the countryside in this isolated location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Present your requirements for the total amount. Then if we want to pick up the subdivisions we will do so.

We want enough descriptive material to adequately indicate the necessity for the appropriation.

Admiral CLARK. Since the war we have received funds in increments of over $9 million to provide for construction of operable transmitter station, a high frequency direction finder station, and a fleet support station, which is now partially completed.

This is for the additional facilities which are required to put those systems into full operation, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see there is nothing here for site. It is that of the building itself and the preparation of the site for the building. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir. We own the land.

Mr SHEPPARD. Go to the next item, heating and emergency powerplant.

Admiral CLARK. This is to furnish heat and power for the receiver station in an outlying area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Essential to the station if it is to become operative.

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed with the garage and rigger shop.

Admiral CLARK. All of the following items, "Garage and rigger shop, personnel building, access roads, antenna system," they are all integral and necessary items in completing outlying station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead with the balance of the items.

Admiral CLARK. We have a personnel building for messing and providing living spaces for the operating personnel, access roads to get there, an antenna system for the receiver station, site preparation in the immediate vicinity of the station, the public works collateral, which is furniture, equipment, and other things which must go into the buildings, technical and collateral installation, this is the electronic equipment, the terminal equipment facilities, this being at another location at the naval station itself which is right at the main center of activity where we are going to have a terminal-equipment building. It includes public works collateral for that building, technical collateral, which is the electronic equipment to go in the building.

To go to the next site, which is the transmitter site, we must erect antennas, install the electronic equipment, and then we go to still another site, which is the receiver and transmitter at the naval station, and where we have the communication control link facility, which is a new facility for doing what they call communication linkages.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Captain, you are the technician in this field as I understand it. Is that correct?

Captain RUFF. I am supposed to be, yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will take it as a fact until such time as it is shown otherwise.

The entire presentation made here is made in three sections.

Captain RUFF. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are all an integral part of the total?

Captain RUFF. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you drop out any one of them you might as well wash out the rest of them. Is that correct?

Captain RUFF. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique connected with this, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This has been advance planned by the district public works officer of the 17th Naval District at Kodiak, Alaska.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And I presume like the others we have referred to it would be subject to a 6 to 10 percent deviation in the final analysis?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I see under item 2, "Heating and emergency powerplant," you want $99.33 per square foot. Is that based on competitive bidding?

Admiral PERRY. Based on experience in that area, Mr. Wigglesworth, we find that the work in Kodiak costs 2.5 times as much as it does for similar construction in the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have a lot of figures in here which are lump sums. This is an access road lump sum figure of $360,000; an antenna system lump sum figure of $1,320,000; a site preparation, roads, walks, utilities and services lump sum figure of $504,000; a technical collateral installation lump sum figure of $479,000; another antenna lump sum figure of $825,000; another technical collateral installation lump sum figure of $767,000.

How good are those figures?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Wigglesworth, I can introduce for the record detailed breakdowns of every one of those items given there if it is desired, or for any individual one of these items if you desire it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What are they based on?

Admiral PERRY. Based on the engineers' estimates, Mr. Wigglesworth, for the individual items we have there.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What engineers?

Admiral PERRY. The engineers at Kodiak.

Take item 4, the personnel building, 18,000 square feet at $43.56 per square foot.

Here is the detailed breakdown on that particular item——

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That doesn't happen to be a lump sum figure. But tell us about that building.

Admiral PERRY. The excavation, fill, and grading is $2,380.

On thousand cubic yards of concrete and block walls there, $286,150. Interior partitions and finish, $51,993. Windows and doors amount to $34,800. Roofing amounts to $7,440. Hardware is $1,500. Miscellaneous is $18,545. Painting is $7,560. Mechanical work, heating and plumbing, which includes 80-horsepower boiler is $120,800.

Kitchen equipment is $36,000. Electrical work, $43,625, and so on. You come up with $784,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It will take care of how many people? Is it 167 enlisted men and 21 officers?

Admiral PERRY. I will ask the Captain to answer that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What personnel will be taken care of in the personnel building?

Captain RUFF. Twenty-one officers and 167 enlisted men in the personnel program.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are they going to be bunked there?

Captain RUFF. Yes, sir; 100 of them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where are they now?

Captain RUFF. They are in a crowded condition at the Naval Station at the present time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why is that not satisfactory?

Captain RUFF. This is a remote site and it is difficult to get the people back and forth from the station for their watches and messing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How far is it?

Captain RUFF. I have a chart to show you the location.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Roughly.

Captain RUFF. Around 14 to 20 miles.

Admiral CLARK. Through very rough country, sir. Kodiak is very rough country.

Captain RUFF. Ten miles, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the personnel building going?

Captain RUFF. Holiday Beach, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the Naval Station?

Captain RUFF. Shown right at this point, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You tell us that these lump-sum figures are all broken down in detail, and that you think they are reasonably good estimates?

Admiral PERRY. I am convinced, Mr. Wigglesworth, that the figures themselves are based on sound engineering judgment; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I inquire further about this personnel building? I think we want to have it clear as to the number to be served by this building.

Mr. Wigglesworth inquired as to whether or not it was to take care of the 21 officers and the 167 enlisted men, which I understand is the personnel strength there.

Yet in the justifications it is pointed out that some of these are living and messing facilities for approximately 100 operational and maintenance personnel.

Which is correct?

Captain RUFF. The 100 is correct, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, these people are not part of thee officer and enlisted personnel?

Captain RUFF. One hundred of that, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That should be clear, because I think we had an affirmative answer to both questions. I thought it was in conflict.

Captain RUFF. It is due to the remoteness of this site that we wish to have the personnel building at the site in order that the communication facility may be operated on a 24-hour-a-day basis 7 days a week.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What were the other people doing before?

Captain RUFF. They have been taken care of at the naval station at Kodiak, which has proven to be unsatisfactory operationally because of the difficulty in transportation back and forth to this remote site, and the crowded condition at the naval station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The planned personnel strength seems to be a combination of 21 officers, 167 enlisted men, and 30 civilians?

Captain RUFF. That is correct, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This new building will take care of 100.

Admiral BRUTON. The new building is at the receiver site which is 10 miles from the naval station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. At Holiday Beach?

Admiral BRUTON. Yes, sir. The rest of the people are at the terminal building and transmitter site. The transmitter site is only 4 miles.

The terminal building is in the vicinity of the naval station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, there are two sites where these same services and facilities are required?

Admiral BRUTON. You mean messing and berthing?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes.

Admiral BRUTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, they are in two locations?

Admiral BRUTON. About 10 miles apart, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, this station was established, according to the record, back in 1917.

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir. That is the main station. In 1917 there was a naval station established there with a small communication station as part of it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Does history show that we acquired these 3,500 acres of land back at the time this station was established?

Admiral CLARK. I would have to supply that information for the record, sir. I do not have it with me.

(The information requested is as follows:)

The 3,500 acres in question are a part of the 34,200 acres which were withdrawn from public domain by Executive Order No. 8278 dated October 12, 1939, and comprised the greater portion of the land acquired at the time of establishment of the naval station, Kodiak.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Since 1917 there has been a gradual development there to the tune of estimated value of $10 million.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is the present value?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And because of the stimulation of your communication requirements, particularly in that part of the world, this appropriation and authorization for some $6,900,000 is necessary?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is necessary to take this whole communication station and really modernize it to the point where it serves your present-day needs?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir.

Naval Communication Facility, Philippine Islands

Mr. Sheppard. All right, gentlemen. We will pick up the next item, "Naval communication facility at Philippine Islands," wherein you make a total request of $10,332,500. This is composed of 11 items which contribute to the total.

At this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, $16,114,500; existing unfunded authorization, $2,271,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,209,000; [3] the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4,480,000; [3] and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,733,000.[4]

This has to do with communications on the same general premises, I assume, so far as requirements are concerned. Is that correct?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Make your presentation as to the requirement.

Admiral Clark. This, sir, is a package composed of 11 items, Mr. Chairman, which are the fifth and sixth increments of consolidation of communication facilities in the Philippine Islands.

The previous authorizations and appropriations have provided for the construction of a receiver and a transmitter facility.

This increment will provide community support, collateral equipment, flood control, bridges, and other facilities to complete the construction.

We hope to have these facilities completed by July of 1957.

I would like to invite your attention, sir, to the chart.

As you can see, the receiver facility is over 20 miles of rough, jungle road, 20 miles from Subic Bay.

The naval station at Subic Bay is the main center, you might say.

The transmitter facility is 10 miles through equally rough and jungle road to the south.

All of these facilities are for the community support and for housing the equipment which has to go into those sites.

Mr. Sheppard. Does that red line starting from Subic Bay, where your first black dot appears, show pickup and relays by deviations in the alinement?

Admiral Clark. That is just a road, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, that is purely a road and there is no intermediate pickup station there?

Admiral Clark. That is right.

Mr. Ostertag. That gray marking is the water?

Admiral Clark. Yes, sir; that is Subic Bay.

Mr. Sheppard. This has the same overall requirement to fit into a chained pattern of operation as those heretofore referred to. Is that correct?

Admiral Clark. That is correct.

Mr. Sheppard. Admiral Perry, what is the engineering technique involved in this project?

Admiral Perry. Advance planning for this project, Mr. Chairman, has been performed by the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco, Calif., at a cost of $11,000.

Mr. Sheppard. By the way, with reference to the bridges involved here, how large a bridge is this?

[3] $5,852,500 for housing not included.
[4] $648,000 for housing not included.

Admiral PERRY. I think there are several bridges.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us pick out the largest one in the group you have shown in your shopping list there.

Admiral PERRY. Near the receiver site, which you can see on the map, there is one 100-foot bridge, single lane, which we will have to put across.

Another 70-foot bridge is near the same site.

A 65-foot single-lane bridge is at the same site.

There is this marshy land where we have to go over these inlets and small streams.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What length of time do you consider would be involved in the construction of what appears to be your largest bridge there, that of 100 feet?

Admiral PERRY. I assume that the contractors are on the site. I would not think it would take him more than 3 weeks to a month to get the thing up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item, Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What about the flood-control item, $467,000? Why do you have to do that work?

Admiral PERRY. There are flash floods throughout this entire area and we have to raise this above the ground and also protect the fill we will have made in order to make sure when there are flash floods we do not have a washout of the areas we are trying to protect.

Admiral CLARK. We can show you the location on the chart. That is the river [indicating] that floods over its banks quite frequently.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the area to the right of the river?

Commander WOY. The proposed enlisted men's housing area.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the area to the left of it?

Commander WOY. The proposed officers' housing area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you yield, Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Perry, as a matter of engineering technique, why is not the line of stream correction made directly not only in the first step but go down and pull in the lower connection as well?

Admiral PERRY. After engineering studies of the situation we have felt—and we think we are correct—that except for the necessity of riprapping the stream, you see this bad bend below that [indicating]. It is off our property. If it does flood over it is not on our property.

Commander WOY. The river has to be moved over so that this building will be protected in its present location [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you figure the sectional engineering cost will be straightening that kink of the river from its first elbow to the second one?

Admiral PERRY. The entire cost of riprapping and providing the new channel runs to $467,000. That is based on a cost factor of 1.5 compared to the United States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Riprap, is that an extension?

Admiral PERRY. No. You are thinking of breakwaters or groins. That is used to prevent a tidal effect on the shoreland.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have an item of land acquisition authorized by Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress but not funded, 1,400

acres at $89.28 per acre for a transmitter site, and 3,800 acres at $176.32 per acre for a receiver site

Admiral CLARK. Those negotiations are underway with the Philippine Government now.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not have a firm figure yet?

Admiral CLARK. No.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the best guess you can make?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We do not own any of the land?

Admiral CLARK. Not for these facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are the facilities there now?

Admiral BRUTON. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is no transmitter or no receiver facility there now?

Admiral CLARK. No. Funds have been authorized and for some of the facilities have been appropriated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This completes it?

Admiral CLARK. Yes. This completes it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In connection with land acquisition, what happens if you are unable to make a satisfactory arrangement or agreement with the Philippine Government for this land?

Admiral BRUTON. In the event the Navy Department is unable to complete negotiations for the additional acreage required for this communication facility, we will endeavor to construct and operate the facility at decreased efficiency on other land in the Philippines on which we now have rights.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. One item calls for an elementary school. I do not think it was made clear whether there are school facilities at this location at the present time and, if not, what is the situation now, how are the children educated?

Admiral CLARK. This school is to be located at the receiver facility which is 20 miles from Subic along a very bad road in that it goes through the jungle. Because of the isolated location of the station, and since there are no schools within 20 miles, we need a small elementary school for the people who are permanently based there and have to live there all the year around.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Where is the school located that is being utilized now?

Admiral CLARK. There are no children at that facility now. It is out in the jungle.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This is planned for the schoolchildren who will be there eventually as this facility is built?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Have you any estimates as to the student population?

Admiral CLARK. We expect to have about 44 officers and 918 enlisted men and 75 civilians, which is a total of over 1,000 people. Out of those, probably 80 percent will be married so we will have about 800 married people living out there, and at 2 children a family it will be about——

I am informed 264 housing units are considered necessary, so there will be 264 families.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Your engineering plan must have been based on some estimate as to what your requirements will be.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, suppose you supply that for the record at this point.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

The school plan was based on a student population of 120 to be housed in 4 classrooms.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Just one more question in connection with the school. I note this is an elementary school. That means, of course, it is for children in the grades. What provision is made for the education of children in high school?

Admiral BRUTON. I used to live in the Philippines and my wife taught the children. Our estimate is that the number of students of high-school age would not warrant the construction funds. They would have to go to Manila or some other locality.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How far is it to Manila?

Admiral BRUTON. 100 miles by land and 65 or 70 miles by sea.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would you provide transportation for the children?

Admiral BRUTON. The children, if they wish to go to high school in Manila, would have to move there and board there. It would be impractical to commute. They could come home on weekends. Subic is a native city. There is probably a Filipino school at Subic. Whether the standards would be high enough for our people would be a matter of judgment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. We have a responsibility here, do we not, to find some answer to that question?

Admiral BRUTON. We have these situations worldwide, sir, and it is up to the individuals to work them out. Sometimes we do not take our families abroad but leave them in the States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we had a discussion, as you recall, in the full subcommittee about this particular question, and it is my thought that the Navy ought to give very, very careful consideration to sending a man with high school aged children out to a spot like that. Naturally he wants to be with his family and I think with all the personnel you have in the Navy you should be able to send men out there who do not have children of high school age. That is all.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION FACILITY, PORT LYAUTEY, FRENCH MOROCCO

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Naval communication facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco," wherein you request a total of $2,848,600 comprised of 12 subitems.

At this installation the plant value is $17,118,000; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $739,000;[5] the proposed 1956 appropriation, $739,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.[6]

Will you present your justifications for the requirements, please?

[5] $2,109,600 for housing not included.
[6] $1,175,900 for housing not included.

Admiral CLARK. These requirements are somewhat similar to those of the Philippines in that there again we have an outlying station. The receiver facility will be 23 miles from the main base and the transmitter facility will be 16 miles from the main base. As you see on the chart, to the eastward 23 miles is the receiver station and down to the south about 16 miles is the transmitter station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where would you locate the recreation and exchange building, for which you are requesting $137,000?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where will you locate the next big item, outdoor swimming pool with bathhouse, for which you are requesting $103,000?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And where will you locate the elementary school, for which you are requesting $39,000?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And where will you locate the storage building for which you are requesting $52,000?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And is the enlisted men's club to be located at the same place?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the hobby shop to be located at the same place?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is a hobby shop?

Admiral CLARK. A hobby shop is a shop where men after hours on days it is too hot to stay outside—it gets to 118 and 120 in that part of the country—can go in and do leather working, develop their own photographs, or pursue whatever hobby they may have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is a vocational recreation center?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Why do you not call it that?

Admiral CLARK. Hobby is shorter, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For family housing you are requesting $2,109,600. Will you give us some details on that?

Admiral CLARK. As we pointed out, these facilities are in an isolated location and these quarters are for people who are going to live on board the station, a total of 122 quarters. Right now some of the people cannot take their families to this area and we hope that by the construction of these quarters fewer families will be separated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you propose to construct 3 senior officer quarters at a unit cost of $26,325; 14 junior officer quarters at a unit cost of $19,760; and 105 enlisted men's quarters at a unit cost of $16,705. That is predicated on what type of percentages?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, that is using the DOD criteria with the application of the cost factor at Port Lyautey of 1.3.

So far as the quarters are concerned, we have not advance planned them. Regarding the receiver and transmitter facilities, the advanced planning has been performed by Reisner, Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows of New York City at a cost of $5,500.

The first four items, the recreation and exchange building at the receiver facility; the storage building at the receiver facility; the incinerator at the receiver facility; and the recreation and exchange building at the transmitter facility, have been advance planned by

the Office of the Director of the Atlantic Division of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in New York City.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This project is an integral part of a total that is essential, is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What do you mean by a recreation and exchange building?

Admiral CLARK. That is a combination of a recreation building where they will have pool tables, reading rooms, and so forth, and an exchange, which will be a small store where they can buy toothpaste and other small articles.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have 2 recreation and exchange buildings, 1 at the receiver facility for which you are requesting $137,000, and 1 at the transmitter facility for which you are requesting $95,000.

You also have a swimming pool for which you are requesting $103,000; and a hobby shop for which you are requesting $31,000.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. This is right out in the desert.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Also an enlisted men's club.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; an enlisted men's club, for which you are requesting $98,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you should bring out the distance between the recreation and exchange building at the receiver facility and the like building at the transmitter facility.

Admiral BRUTON. There is a distance of 30 miles between the receiver and the transmitter facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the hobby shop to be located?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station. There are times when we cannot permit our people to go through the town of Port Lyautey because of political difficulties.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the swimming pool to be located?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And where is the enlisted men's club to be located?

Admiral CLARK. At the receiver station, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How many men will be stationed at the transmitter station?

Admiral CLARK. At the transmitter station we eventually plan to have 4 officers and 100 enlisted men. At present we have 3 officers and 93 enlisted men.

Mr. OSTERTAG. They will be required to travel 30 miles to the receiver station in order to have the benefit of these facilities?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir. They will be at the receiver station. They will live at the receiver station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then they travel back and forth to their work? The transmitting station is how far from the receiving station?

Admiral CLARK. About 55 miles by road.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But all of these new facilities are going to be constructed adjacent to the receiving station?

Admiral CLARK. Almost all of them, because most of the people live there. Down at the transmitting station, the people can go to the air station which has recreational facilities, hobby shops, movies. They do not have to go through the native city. The people can

travel along this road most of the time with safety, so that we do not need to supply as much here as we do here [indicating]. This is out in the middle and there are sometimes a week or two when the commanding officer says "No traveling along that road for women and children, or people who are not on official business" and in those cases they are shut off. That is why we are applying almost everything to that radio receiving station and only 1 or 2 items for the transmitting station.

Mr. OSTERTAG. But the transmitting personnel can go to the airbase.

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; and of course that is under another bureau.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I note in your justification that these facilities are to be located on a total of 4,762 acres of leased land. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. That land is leased from the French Government and we have a treaty with France that expires in 1963.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is the understanding that the lease would be within the period of the treaty entered into with France?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. After that time there is no way of determining what can be done?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct, sir. We have a reasonable expectation that the French Government will renew it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are these buildings and properties and facilities being constructed on a long-range planning basis?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; they are.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Even though we might lose them after the end of the lease?

Admiral PERRY. That is right. There is nothing temporary about the most of this construction, Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are some SAC bases in that general vicinity?

Admiral PERRY. There is one just 14 miles from the radio receiving station.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION UNIT NO. 1, EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item which is reflected as classified, "Naval Communication Unit No. 1, eastern Mediterranean—operational communication facilities" wherein you are asking for $771,000.

At this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $771,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $771,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, none.

Proceed to make your presentation there, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is for the construction of an antenna system, transmitting and receiving facilities, and installation of electronics equipment on a site to be provided by the United States Air Force in the eastern Mediterranean area. The Navy portion of that facility is required to support fleet operations in the area and without this item we will have a serious deficiency of communications support for naval operating forces in the Mediterranean.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not only a highly specified requirement, but is one of high classification; is not that true?

Admiral CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique connected with this project, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. Because of the lack of knowledge as regards the location of the site, it was impracticable to do any fundamental and detailed advance planning on this project. However, a suitable site was selected last month and the Navy will now confer with the Air Force, who will design and construct this facility as part of a facility which they will construct. In other words, the figures put in here we frankly admit to you have been pulled out of the air.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who is going to be in command of this facility? Is it to be one of those joint commands in which, in this instance, the Air Force would have a greater amount of interest than the Navy?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; although, within that command, we will have naval representation and he will be in charge of the Navy part of the operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Based on prior experience, will this be put on land we own, on leased land, or what is the probable picture?

Admiral CLARK. On land leased from the Government concerned and the Air Force will be the leasing agency and they have it in their program.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, NORTH ATLANTIC AREA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item which also is classified "Naval radio station, North Atlantic area," where you are asking for transmitting equipment to the extent of $4 million.

At this installation the plant value is none; funded construction not in the plant value, none; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $4 million; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $4 million; and the estimated future appropriation required, $23 million.

Make the presentation of the justification for that requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is the first increment of a program which will provide for low-frequency transmitting and traffic handling capabilities and coverage in doing communications of a classified nature.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have we proven out our transmission device to a degree that we can operate in that atmospheric condition satisfactorily?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Apparently this is going to be a rather extensive operation because of the nature of the breakdown of subsequent increments amounting to approximately $23 million. Is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir. This is simply for the transmitter equipment this time. We will come in for the later increments for housing facilities, antennas, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been advance planned?

Admiral PERRY. No; this has not been advance planned since the $4 million requested is purely for the acquisition of VLF transmitter equipment. However, we have made a cost analysis of the VLF transmitting station, and we came up with the figures. We know the

cost will probably run for equipment plus the station approximately $27 million.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to thank you, Admiral, for your presentation before the committee.

Admiral BRUTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; it is a pleasure to be here.

NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES, CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up next "Naval research facilities, continental."

Captain, do you have a statement prepared on this item?

GENERAL STATEMENT

Captain TUCKER. This is a statement of the Director, Naval Research Laboratory.

The public-works construction program sponsored by the Office of Naval Research for fiscal year 1956 consists of 4 projects estimated to cost $215,000. The projects requested are for supporting facilities urgently required for effective prosecution of the existing research program.

Three projects are requested for the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C. One of these projects is the installation of an additional boiler in the central heating plant to provide for the increased heating load brought on by progressively increasing occupancy of old buildings, and by new loads imposed by recently constructed buildings. The other two projects are a radiological decontamination facility and a radiac building which are required to carry out currently assigned navywide research programs.

The one project requested for the Chesapeake Bay Annex of the Naval Research Laboratory at Randle Cliff, Md., is an offshore research structure, including land acquisition, to provide adequate facilities for research on the underwater reception of radio signals of various wavelengths by submarines. Land acquisition for this project entails only procurement of necessary permits for construction in waters of the Chesapeake Bay.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

By 1956, public works program, April 18, 1955

I. OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

A. The expansion of heating facilities at a station where seriously critical deficiencies exist:

Project location and title:	*Authorization and appropriation request, fiscal year 1956*
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C.: Central heating plant; install additional boiler	$54,000
Total (authorized and appropriated)	54,000

B. The improvement and increase of facilities for research and development in the fields of radiological decontamination, radiac standards and VLF radio communications:

Project location and title:	*Authorization and appropriation request, fiscal year 1956*
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C.:	
Radiological decontamination facility	$59,000
Radiac building	50,000
Chesapeake Bay Annex of Naval Research Laboratory, Randle Cliff, Md.: Offshore research structure (including land acquisition)	52,000
Total (authorization and appropriation)	161,000

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, WASHINGTON, BELLEVUE, D. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under "Naval research facilities, continental," you have an item for "Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, Bellevue, D. C.," wherein you are asking for $163,000 made up of 3 requirements—additional boiler, $54,000; radiological decontamination facility, $59,000; and radiac building, $50,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $15,591,554; funded construction not in the plant value, $1,893,616; existing unfunded authorization, none; the proposed 1956 authorization, $163,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $163,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $2,608,000.

Present your justification for this item, please.

Admiral CLARK. This item is to expand the three-boiler central heating plant by installing a fourth boiler obtained from surplus to provide for an increased load. The increased load has been handled by operating at progressively higher firing rates, which reduces fuel efficiency and increases the danger of burned-out tubes. The point has been reached where there is no reserve capacity to handle foreseeable additional heating loads or a shutdown of one of the boilers for inspection or repairs.

The radiological decontamination facility, item 2, is required because numerous strong sources of radioactive isotopes and nine high level particle accelerators are used at the Naval Research Laboratory and decontamination of equipment returned from atomic test sites is necessary as field decontaminates only to the level required by shipping regulations and further decontamination is necessary so that they can continue to use equipment they have taken out to this outlying station. When they bring the equipment back, they need to decontaminate it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are we operating in this field and function elsewhere; if so, where?

Captain TUCKER. The equipment taken into the field is decontaminated sufficiently for transportation before it leaves the field. It is not decontaminated sufficiently for reconditioning in detail at the laboratory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the laboratory is for the purpose of completing the decontamination; is that correct?

Captain TUCKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you are able to accomplish that end result as of now?

Captain TUCKER. We do it in an unsatisfactory manner now. We decontaminate in the open and there is some danger of contaminated material getting into the watershed areas and going down into the rivers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are doing, then, by the request here is confining your activities so that they will not be in the danger category, by disassociation from the actual location where you are working; is that correct?

Captain TUCKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume the additional boiler is a component part of the total facility. Does it have anything to do with the decontamination principle?

Captain TUCKER. No, sir; it is a separate item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What size boilers do you have there?

Captain TUCKER. We have three boilers and they are away above capacity now.

Admiral CLARK. In other words, they have to overload the boilers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And your load requirement will be satisfied by an additional boiler of what capacity?

Captain TUCKER. 25,000 pounds an hour.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would you define a radiac building as being?

Captain TUCKER. May I define the coined word "radiac"?

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will.

Captain TUCKER. Radiac is a coined term used by the Department of Defense for radiological measuring instruments. It includes Geiger counters and related instruments. The radiac building is to house the standard for calibrating radiac instruments. The work is now done in a small and very unsatisfactory location. This will provide adequate facilities for a laboratory to meet its responsibilities to the Navy in the calibration of radiac instruments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you dealing with—impulses?

Captain TUCKER. Nuclear radiation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that basic impulses?

Captain TUCKER. Yes, sir—gamma rays, beta rays, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has any engineering been done on this?

Admiral PERRY. For item 1, it was advance planned by the Bureau of Yards and Docks; items 2 and 3 were advance planned by Luflin McGaughy & Associates, Washington, D. C., at a cost of $1,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course that is advance planning for the physical properties, but not for the mechanical devices to which the gentleman referred?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; not at all.

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, CHESAPEAKE BAY ANNEX, RANDALL CLIFF, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item, "Chesapeake Bay Annex, Naval Research Laboratory, Randall Cliff, Md.," where you are requesting $52,000 for an offshore research structure, including land acquisition.

At this installation the plant value is $1,964,000; funded construction not in the plant value, $3,107,000; existing unfunded authorization, $93,000; the proposed 1956 authorization, $52,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $52,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $556,000.

Present your justification for this requirement, please.

Admiral CLARK. This is just for a small amount of land on which to erect a platform and tower and a copper-shielded building in which

we will put the generator and transformers for performing experimental work in very low frequency radio communications and direction finding. It is connected with the classified operation that Admiral Bruton told you about, except here they do the precise measurements that will test our results, particularly in operating the submarines, and we have already gotten permits from the Department of the Army and the Coast Guard and the Maryland State officials have certified they will interpose no objection to the acquisition of the land, because actually the land is all under water. We are just asking for a place in the water where we can erect the tower.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice under "Land acquisition" the words "nil; nominal."

Admiral CLARK. Yes. There may be a small overhead involved in going through the legal procedure of acquiring the land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But nothing comparable with a transaction of this character?

Admiral CLARK. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering technique performed on this project?

Admiral PERRY. Advance plans were by John G. Lochler, Washington, D. C., at a cost of $750,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, gentlemen, for your appearance. The committee will stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1955.

INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

LORAN STATIONS

WITNESSES

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

VICE ADM. ALFRED C. RICHMOND, COMMANDANT
COMDR. P. E. TRIMBLE, CHIEF, BUDGET AND COST ANALYSIS DIVISION
LT. COMDR. E. D. SCHEIDERER, ASSISTANT CHIEF, BUDGET AND COST ANALYSIS DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES NAVY

CAPT. F. C. LUCAS, JR., OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
COMDR. S. H. MacGREGOR, JR., OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order. We have an item, under "Interservice activities, loran stations," for construction of additional loran stations by the Coast Guard, to remain available until expended, $4,200,000, which shall be transferred to the appropriation, "Acqusition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard."

We will take up that item at this time.

Captain LUCAS. I am Capt. F. C. Lucas, Jr., attached to the Office, Chief of Naval Operations.

I have a short prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, which I will read or submit for the record, as you wish.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, proceed.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Captain LUCAS. Loran is an electronic system of navigation which provides to ships and aircraft continuous navigational positions by means of intersecting lines of position. This system works day and night in good weather and bad. Its range for optimum positioning is between 600 and 800 miles from the station. In order to provide full coverage, numerous stations must be sited on land in any given area. In 1951, a plan was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide Loran coverage in all areas of the world in which a requirement for its use by the United States Navy and United States Air Force was forseeable. Some stations in this plan have been installed but complete coverage is not yet available. As you can see from the chart, there are several areas in which there is little or no navigational coverage at this time. The appropriation requested for fiscal year 1956 will provide coverage in three of these areas. There will remain certain additional areas to be covered in succeeding years.

The necessity for loran coverage rests primarily on the fact that the United States Navy must be prepared to operate at sea and in the air wherever our presence may be required. In order to carry out these operations efficiently, we must have a means of navigation which will work under all conditions of weather. Loran is the only navigational aid available today which will provide this service, and it appears that loran will continue to be the only available system for some time. Loran is a proven system which is already well established and has been used successfully for years. Production of the equipment necessary for the system presents no problem since its builders have been in the business for 10 years or more. Loran has been accepted by the NATO organization as a standard long-range navigational system for its Armed Forces. It is also used extensively by commercial shipping, private yachtsmen, fishermen, and commercial airlines.

In the defense of the United States, it is essential that our ships and aircraft know their precise navigational position at all times. Ordinary means such as celestial navigation are often impossible to use due to weather conditions. Furthermore, celestial navigation takes time, which is of great importance in fast flying aircraft which may be many miles along their track by the time mathematical computation required in determining position by celestial means is completed. Loran provides a navigational position almost instantaneously at any time.

That completes the prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see we have with us Admiral Richmond, Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Admiral RICHMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any comments you wish to make?

Admiral RICHMOND. No, sir. I am prepared to answer any questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand the loran operation, it is a chain operation, functionally speaking.

Captain LUCAS. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Each military service has its proportionate responsibility therein. At this time you are making a presentation of requirement under the supplemental I referred to to the extent of $4,200,000. Is that correct?

Captain LUCAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The purpose of the Coast Guard is to establish justification for their portion of this entire operation. Is that correct?

Captain LUCAS. I did not understand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the Coast Guard is an integral part of the total Loran system?

Captain LUCAS. Yes, sir. They are charged by law with installation and operation of the system. It is Public Law 786 of the 80th Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right. They are not exclusively in that field?

Captain LUCAS. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The other military people are in the field, creating the total in the Loran program. Isn't that correct?

Captain LUCAS. Yes, sir. The Coast Guard is exclusive in the field of operating them at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Exclusively in the field?

Captain LUCAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Nobody operating loran except the Coast Guard?

Captain LUCAS. In the United States. There are a few foreign installations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Operated by other military branches. Is that not true?

Captain LUCAS. Not in the United States; no, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are not?

Captain LUCAS. Not at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many stations are you operating at the present time?

Admiral RICHMOND. Forty-six, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are they located?

Admiral RICHMOND. The chart shows it better than I can explain it, sir. Commander MacGregor will explain it.

Commander MACGREGOR. They are spread from Japan to Greenland roughly, sir.

Generally speaking they are on both coasts of the United States, out in the Aleutian chain, in Japan, the Philippines, the Pacific Islands here, the Hawaiian Islands, the east coast of the United States, and in the Baffin Bay area near Greenland. Those are the ones operated by the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to adjust my thinking on this type of operation, the loran function is specifically that of the Coast Guard navigationally speaking and is in no manner a contributing factor in the warning operation?

Captain LUCAS. This is strictly a navigational positioning device which has a valuable application to all kinds of naval operations, as well as commercial ship and overseas air operations.

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you are going to establish information from your loran function, and it has any value, obviously it is communicated to the forces, so it is a contributing factor to the total.

Captain LUCAS. Very definitely, Mr. Chairman; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you going to expend the $4,200,000 if it is granted by the committee, and where are you going to locate these stations?

Captain LUCAS. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of engineering pertaining to the estimates? What is the engineering technique upon which these figures were derived?

Admiral RICHMOND. The equipment costs, as already indicated by Captain Lucas, are pretty well established because we have been building this equipment for well over 10 years.

The cost of building installations is predicated on average costs that we have encountered with similar type constructions in comparable zones in the past.

As Captain Lucas indicated, most of these stations are relatively isolated, and it varies considerably depending upon what contractors are available and how you can move in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When was the last one built, where was it geographically, and what was the cost?

Admiral RICHMOND. The Thule chain was the last one built. It cannot be used because the costs on that were exorbitant as compared with these, sir. Costs ran about $2,200,000 a station for that because the stations were above the frostline, and many peculiar problems arose which we will not have in the particular stations named here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did I understand you correctly to say it was built but it cannot be used?

Admiral RICHMOND. Cannot be used as a basis for estimating, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of extreme cost which prevailed in that particular location. Is that correct?

Admiral RICHMOND. That is correct, sir. It would be of no value.

The last stations which were relatively comparable to these which were built, were those built for the Philippine east chain and in Angar. They averaged about $550,000 a station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the method for handling contracts in expenditures of this character? I am not talking specifically about the mechanical devises which go into the building but the construction of it.

Do you operate on a competitive-bid basis after you have formulated your blueprints and plans for the purpose of bidding?

Admiral RICHMOND. We do, sir. If there are any bidders available in the area we do that.

All of the new construction has been done by competitive bid.

In the project supporting Tule, that was handled by the Army engineers because they were in that area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. At this point we will insert this table.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

LORAN CONSTRUCTION TO MEET DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS, $4,200,000

This is part of a continuing program to provide loran coverage to fill the specific requirements of the Department of Defense. Coast Guard responsibility includes construction, operation, and maintenance of the necessary loran stations in accordance with established priorities. However, construction costs are to be funded by the Department of Defense.

The project provides for partial accomplishment of the loran installation plan by the construction and establishment of seven additional loran stations in areas essential to the defense of the United States. Location will be in accordance with priorities established by the Department of Defense.

Electronic equipment per station	$266,502
Antennas and ground systems (1 T antenna and 300 feet ground system; 1 communication receiving antenna and 72 feet ground system; 3 antennas and 50 feet ground system)	26,466
Power signal buildings with generator and distiller	104,866
Other buildings (barracks, galley mess, recreation, quarters, storage garage)	58,800
Utilities	55,600
Other equipment and supplies	22,500
Grading, roads, gasoline storage	21,500
Miscellaneous (trucks, etc.)	4,200
Construction equipment	22,066
Equipment for 1 station	82,500
Equipment for 7 stations	4,077,500
Administrative expenses:	
Temporary employment of supervisory and engineering personnel	70,000
Administrative travel	35,000
Administrative supplies	17,500
Total administrative expenses	122,500
Total requested for 7 stations	4,200,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand this includes seven new stations?

Admiral RICHMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You mentioned four which were not to be in the picture.

Captain LUCAS. These stations are operated as groups in a location. It takes 2 synchronized stations to give 1 line of position, or 3 stations at the minimum to give 2 lines of positions which definitely will fix a position.

In ———— 1 station is required in conjunction with the existing installations in the vicinity, and in the ———— and ———— 3 additional stations are required.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The administrative expense is applicable to all seven stations?

Admiral RICHMOND. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Clark, I wish you would make a check of the results of the Senate and House joint action on H. R. 6829, and present to us changes in the bill which obviously would have to follow, and also give us more detail pertaining to this adjustment on the $530 million to which Admiral Smith referred.

Admiral CLARK. Very well, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, gentlemen.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES—CONTINENTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up next the item in our justifications, yards and docks facilities, continental.

Admiral Perry, do you have a general statement to make on the subject?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement and in order to save time I should like to submit it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will insert it in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

XI. YARDS AND DOCKS AND FACILITIES

In this category are included 12 projects which will require appropriation in the amount of $52,708,300. In general, its aim is to provide urgently required facilities at naval activities under the management control of the Bureau of Yards and Docks (and at other activities not covered by separate classification) and to provide professional engineering services to the various branches of the Navy. Its specific objectives are:

A. Improvement and modernization of the electric power systems serving complex naval establishments at respective locations:

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
Canal Zone: Conversion of electric power system from 25-cycle sensitivity to 60-cycle	$2, 529, 000
PWC. Norfolk, Va. (Sewall Point area): Increase capacity of the electrical distribution system	2, 510, 000

B. Provision of urgently required facilities at naval construction battalion centers:

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
CBC. Davisville, R. I.:	
Marginal wharf	$4, 399, 000
Dehumidified warehouse	998, 000
CBC. Port Hueneme, Calif.: Construction equipment facilities	1, 225, 000

C. Provision of two highway bridges including land easements on the main highway of Guam to replace two temporary wooden bridges which have deteriorated to the point where they are unsafe to carry currently imposed loads:

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
Guam, Marianas Islands: Two highway bridges	$940, 000

D. Provision of ready funds for restoration or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by acts of God or other disasters at naval and Marine Corps activities either continental or overseas. In effect this is an "insurance" fund protecting over $7,900 million worth of structures, utilities, equipment, and land of the Naval Shore Establishment:

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
Not applicable: Correction of deficiencies	$6, 000, 000

E. Provision of water pollution abatement facilities for naval continental shore activities in accordance with the Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.) and Executive Order 10014 of November 3, 1948:

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
Various locations: Pollution abatement program	$15, 149, 000

F. This project proposes payment to the Panama Canal Company for 40 quarters in use by the Navy since 1942, and alterations to the quarters to bring them to minimum Navy standards for public quarters. Payment to the Canal Company is $465,000 and rehabilitation, $75,000.

Location:	*Appropriation request fiscal year 1956*
Canal Zone: Acquisition of 40 quarters	$540, 000

G. Provision of intelligent and realistic schematic plans and estimates for projects to be included in future public-works programs. In some cases to provide contract drawings and specifications in order to reduce the construction lead time by approximately 9 months on urgently required projects. Authorization was provided by Public Law 155, 82d Congress; no amount specified:

Location:	*Appropriation request, fiscal year 1956*
Not applicable: Advance planning for future public-works projects	$15, 000, 000

H. The fourth increment in the economical replacement of 2,400 units of temporary, substandard, high-cost maintenance overseas housing with permanent facilities of low maintenance costs. This program envisages replacement of 380 units on Guam and 60 units in the Philippines. Authorization was granted for this program by Public Law 534, 82d Congress.

Location:	*Appropriation request, fiscal year 1956*
Guam and Philippines: Replacement of temporary housing	$2, 200, 000

I. To provide funds to rehabilitate 487 substandard quarters to make them more livable. Authorization was granted for this project by Public Law 765, 83d Congress.

Location:	*Appropriation request, fiscal year 1956*
Various locations, continental and overseas: Rehabilitation of existing housing	$1, 218, 300

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, R. I.

Mr. Sheppard. We will pick up the first item, "Naval Construction Battalion center, Davisville, R. I.," wherein your total request is for $5,397,000, comprised of two items, a marginal wharf, for which you are requesting $4,399,000, and a dehumidified warehouse, for which you are requesting $998,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is $25,017,193; funded construction not in plant value is $4,746,077; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed 1956 authorization is $5,397,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation is $5,397,000; the estimated future appropriation required is $17,782,000.

Present your justifications for this requirement.

Admiral Clark. The first project is a marginal wharf for Davisville in order to have the capacity to outload advance base material now stored at Davisville. Three berths are available now at an existing pier. An existing wooden bulkhead which has deteriorated and no longer protects the shoreline or retains the material staging area at the head of the pier must be replaced by the marginal wharf thus providing three berths. The dredging required to make the wharf

usable will reclaim an additional berth at the pier for a total of seven berths available which are required for outloading.

The second project is for a dehumidified warehouse. This is required to maintain advance base mobilization reserve stock now at Davisville in condition for immediate shipment overseas in the event of national emergency. Annual savings of $610,000 in equipment deterioration and preservation will liquidate the construction within 2 years after the warehouse is filled.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the length of time contemplated to fill the warehouse?

Admiral PERRY. We would expect the plans and specifications would be completed 120 days or 4 months after September of this year, that the construction would be started in February 1956. It would probably take 270 days to complete. That would be the end of 1956 before the warehouse would be completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature connected with these two projects

Admiral PERRY. The advance planning for the marginal wharf was performed by Jenks & Ballou of Providence, R. I., at a cost of $17,000.

The advance planning for the dehumidified warehouse was performed by the office of the district public works officer of the 1st Naval District, Boston, Mass.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see the largest item reflected is that of dredging, where you have 2,204,700 cubic yards at 69 cents, a total of $1,520,000.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is this dredging necessary? Has something filled in on you or what?

Admiral PERRY. This is created by several factors. By reason of the failure of the wooden bulkhead the shoreline has sloughed off into the water, and we have tidal drifts against the north side. This dredging will reclaim an additional berth at the pier that is there now but cannot be used. The dredging would go to a depth of 30 feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice in the justifications "Plant value (land and construction January 1, 1954), $25,017,193." What does that mean?

Admiral CLARK. That is the cost.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The estimated overall cost?

Admiral CLARK. The actual cost of the facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now in being?

Admiral CLARK. Now in being. That is not a replacement value.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the actual value of what you have now?

Admiral CLARK. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You want to increase that to roughly $48 million?

Admiral CLARK. Not this year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You show the estimated future appropriation required as $17,782,000 and the proposed for fiscal year 1956, $5,397,000. That is $23 million added to the $25 million you already have.

Admiral CLARK. That is advance planning. I believe you were absent, Mr. Wigglesworth, when we explained that that final figure is the amount we estimate will be required to place a station in full readiness for mobilization. We can tell you how we will phase that generally but it may not be accurate. If conditions change we will not ask for the $17 million.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You mean that the fact that we have put $25 million into this already and that you are asking us to put in $5 million more now, does not necessarily mean we will have to go any further; we can stop right here if we so desire?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For the wharf you have an estimate of $2,163,000 based on 1,200 linear feet at $1,802 per linear foot.

Admiral PERRY. That is a misprint. It is 1,800 linear feet at $1,202 per linear foot.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The figures are just reversed?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that $1,202 per linear foot in line with your recent actual experience?

Admiral PERRY. It is for that area; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What kind of wharf will it be?

Admiral PERRY. This will be a reinforced concrete wharf, Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the importance of the dehumidified warehouse at this time?

Admiral PERRY. We have large stocks of electrical equipment, telephone switchboards, electronics equipment, that are kept in this Advance Base Depot for advance base mobilization stocks. If that type of equipment is not kept under proper storage conditions with respect to humidity and temperature there is rapid deterioration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is it kept now?

Admiral PERRY. It is kept in an ordinary warehouse that is not dehumidified and some is kept outside.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are only 18 miles south of Providence. Is there not some place you can store it without paying $998,000 for a dehumidified warehouse?

Admiral PERRY. You might find a warehouse at Providence. On the other hand, this material should be stored at the point from which it will be shipped and if part were stored at Providence and part at Davisville you would get in one whale of a mess when it came time to ship them out as units.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are only a matter of minutes away by automobile.

Admiral PERRY. I have traveled that distance by automobile and it usually takes me about an hour.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. To travel 18 miles?

Admiral PERRY. It is through heavy traffic and a heavily populated area, one town right next to another.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

64997—55——22

PUBLIC WORKS CENTER (NAVAL BASE), NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, public works center (naval base), Norfolk, Va., wherein you request $2,510,000 for improvements to the electrical power system.

I note at this installation the plant value is $197,650,408; funded construction not in plant value is $1,842,280; existing unfunded authorization is none; the proposed 1956 authorization is $2,510,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation is $2,510,000; the estimated future appropriation required is $9,838,000.

Present the justifications for that requirement.

Admiral CLARK. This is for improvements in the electrical power system at this Public Works Center where the existing load on the electrical system has reached the capacity of transformers and primary distribution lines. New construction now in progress will increase the peak electrical demand by 27 percent. Projects to be completed in the summer of 1956 will add an additional 6 percent. Without this item a fire hazard will exist from overloading and use of electricity will have to be curtailed resulting in inefficient operation and waste of expended funds, and we will have no reserve electrical power at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see in the composition of your requirements you want a 34.5 kilovolt switching station at $92,400; distribution lines at $1,334,400; and substations—how many substations does that mean, two?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For $1,083,200?

Admiral PERRY. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they about equally divided in this cost?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the engineering features connected with this project, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This project was advance planned by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, of Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $3,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not understand what you are going to do. What do you mean by public works support and services?

Admiral PERRY. The public works center at the naval base at Norfolk handles all the public works functions for the various activities which compose the base, that is, the supply center, the base itself, the naval station.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What kind of services?

Admiral PERRY. Public works services.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What does that include?

Admiral PERRY. It includes repairs to all their structures, service to heating plants, cleaning of grounds, collection of garbage, repairs to roads, repairs to the piers.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Services similar to those performed by the public works department of a city?

Admiral PERRY. Essentially, yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You say this is "To provide public works support and services of a technical nature." What does that mean?

Admiral PERRY. It may be a study of termites that are eating up the wood and a determination of how to get rid of them. It also

involves the determination, if you have to repair a building that possibly has rotted timbers, whether you have to tear them out.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are doing all that right now, are you not?

Admiral PERRY. Certainly.

Mar. WIGGLESWORTH. Why do you need this additional public works center?

Admiral PERRY. The public works center, Mr. Wigglesworth, is the activity that performs this service for all the component parts of the naval base at Norfolk. You have a consolidated public works department.

Admiral CLARK. The Roman title II at the top where it says "Mission" simply tells what the job of the station is, and the project itself is down under V, what we are proposing this year at the station that has that job.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why do you need this switching station, distribution lines and substations?

Admiral PERRY. Because the power we have at the base is inadequate to supply the buildings and facilities presently on the base and in course of construction. If we do not have additional capacity we will either have to overload our transformers and lines——

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In other words, you are putting up so much new construction, you need more power?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you generate your own power there?

Admiral PERRY. No. We buy it from the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, these facilities are more or less the means by which you control and handle the power you buy?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What is the general setup of one of these substations?

Admiral PERRY. For instance, we will have what we call a substation where the Virginia Electric & Power Co. brings in their supply at the central distribution point. It is at that point where we will put in the switching station in order to take additional leads or power from it. We take this at a high voltage and distribute it to central points throughout the area at high voltage to many substations over the area, our own substations. It may be distributed at 13,000 volts. That is called the primary system. Then there are transformers in the substations and we will step that high voltage of, say, 13,200 volts down to 4,400 volts and distribute it to another substation that will step it down further.

Mr. OSTERTAG. You have an item of $1,083,200 for substations.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How many substations will that cover?

Admiral PERRY. That will take care of two main substations within the yard itself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many do you have now?

Admiral PERRY. I would have to give you that for the record. We have any number of them. I do not have that figure with me.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are these two new substations in addition to those already operating under the public works center at Norfolk?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will you supply the answer to the question propounded by Mr. Wigglesworth for the record.

Admiral PERRY. I have that information now. We have 11 now.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And this will make a total of 13?

Admiral PERRY. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER, PORT HUENEME, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, reflected as the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif., wherein you are requesting $1,225,000 for construction equipment facilities.

I note at this installation the plant value is $31,089,278; funded construction not in plant value is $4,450,000; existing unfunded authorizarion is $3,384,000; proposed 1956 authorization is $1,225,000; proposed 1956 appropriation is $1,225,000; the estimated future appropriation required is $35,803,000.

Proceed with your justifications for this requirement.

Admiral CLARK. Adequate construction equipment facilities are required for the rehabilitation, modification, maintenance and testing of 10,552 pieces of advance base mobilization reserve equipment valued at $70 million. It is required now in order to eliminate the fire hazards in the existing 17 widely scattered tarpaper and wooden shop buildings and to improve efficiency. A new contact preservation program is being inaugurated which makes the need for this building urgent. We are requesting $1,225,000 for the construction of these facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Define the term "contact preservation."

Admiral PERRY. Contact preservation is the inspection of each piece of machinery that has to undergo these tests and to insure that the engines have been turned over and that you have had a flow of oil through the whole lubricating system to each one of the points that must receive that lubrication.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It means as you have expressed here, a functional performance?

Admiral PERRY. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will you do with those tarpaper shacks if you are given this money?

Admiral PERRY. We will tear them down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is something you should have done 5 years ago.

Admiral PERRY. We should have but if we had we would be right out in the open.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is an assumption, I think, on your part. You might have gotten some money then perhaps as well as you might get it now.

Admiral PERRY. I think the chairman is correct on that score.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature on this project?

Admiral PERRY. The advance planning was performed by Bohlen, Rule & Bohlen of Los Angeles, Calif., at a cost of $11,900.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the collateral in this justification have the same meaning as previously testified to?

Admiral PERRY. Generally speaking the collateral is machine tools and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no questions.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, explain briefly the meaning of "Funded construction not in plant value."

Admiral PERRY. Under that heading, Mr. Ostertag, you have three categories of projects. You may have ar item which has been authorized and appropriated for and has been completed but has not been picked up by the accountants and put in the plant value. You may have an item that is partially completed and has not been put in the plant value. Or you may have a project which has not even been put under contract yet.

In this particular instance the $4,450,000 referred to includes $4 million for 10 barracks and a 1,500-man subsistence building and shop, and a laboratory for $450,000. Those buildings have been completed and are occupied but the items have not been picked up and put in the plant value. Under item 1 you see plant value of $31,081,278. If you picked up the $4,450,000 in item 2, you would have over $35 million plant value.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Under item 3 you show existing unfunded authorization of $3,384,000 and you compare that with the $4,450,000 under item 2 that is funded. One is unfunded and the other is funded?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct. There have been authorizations from previous Congresses for $3,384,000 that have not been funded. We have not received funds to go ahead with the projects.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are any of the items involved in this justification included in these authorizations?

Admiral PERRY. Will you repeat that question, please?

Mr. OSTERTAG. You pointed out that the $3,384,000 constitutes authorization but not money appropriated and spent.

Admiral PERRY. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I ask if any of the items under this justification are a part of that authorization?

Admiral PERRY. No. The $3,384,000 consisted of authorization for 2 items, 1 was to reconstruct wharf 3 and the second was for 2 dehumidified warehouses. It so happens that as of the 1st of June in one case and 23d of June in the other case, savings from prior appropriations have made it possible to award contracts for both of those items and they are presently under contract. They had not been put under contract at the time this was prepared.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAM, INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION, VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, pollution abatement program, including land acquisition, various locations, wherein you are requesting $15,149,000. That is reflected on page C11–5 of your justifications.

Will you pick up this series of items listed in the justifications and present your requirements for each one of them?

GENERAL STATEMENT

Admiral CLARK. This is a series of items, sir, and I shall lead off. It is a package project in that the reason we want to do this is that the work is the same for all stations.

We made a survey of all the stations in the United States where either we were on the verge or actually in violation of a State or local law in respect to the disposal of sewage or where the local conditions made it obvious by our own testing of surrounding water that we soon would be in violation and perhaps were endangering the health of the community.

As a result of this nationwide survey, we made up this list, which comprises only the ones where we are in violation of the law and we must request the Congress for money to permit us to install sewage treatment plants or pipe connections which will permit us to pipe into local sewage disposal systems in order to comply with the law and also to comply with Executive Order 10014 of November 3, 1948.

The stations are listed and I can read them off.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Give the name of the station and the amount of money required.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

Admiral CLARK. The first is the Naval Air Station at Alameda, Calif., where we are requesting $223,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For what purpose there?

Admiral CLARK. The Regional Water Pollution Control Board of the State of California for the San Francisco Bay region——

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I want to know is what is the corrective proposal that you have before you in that particular location for that particular job.

Admiral CLARK. This is to prevent the contamination of the Oakland Estuary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But what are you going to construct to eliminate that problem?

Admiral CLARK. We are going to construct 16-inch mains from the station through flow meters across areas where we will require easements across the pipe and I think we will pipe into the city of Alameda's sewage disposal system. Is that not correct, Admiral Perry?

Admiral PERRY. This project contemplates the abandonment of the existing primary sewage treatment plant with outfall and the construction of the necessary sewers and appurtenances to pump the sewage from naval air station, Alameda, to the new sewerage facilities constructed at naval supply center, Oakland. The capacity of the facilities constructed at Oakland is sufficient to handle the mobilization flows from both the naval supply center, Oakland, and the naval air station, Alameda. The facilities constructed at Oakland will provide adequate sewage disposal facilities to the city of Oakland sewer system, with ultimate sewage treatment and disposal in the East Bay Municipal Utility District's sewage treatment and disposal plant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to have to pay any funds to the city for its picking up of your sewage and taking it from that point?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is a continuity of cost after you establish the lines. What will you be paying the municipality once you get your hookup established?

Mr. ANDREWS. The service charge.

Admiral PERRY. The project analysis of this advance planning indicates this project to be economically sound and this conclusion is based upon the cost analysis shown in the advance planning report prepared for this project by the district public works office, Twelfth Naval District on 20 August 1954.

We take our annual cost, which includes interest, depreciation, operation and maintenance and come down to a cost of $18,511.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I take it you do not have segregated the municipal cost for its part of the service to the Navy?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir.

Mr SHEPPARD. It is a part of the total but not broken down?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that for the record.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

(The following information was supplied for the record:)

At naval air station, Alameda, the estimated annual cost for sewage treatment based on present average flow would be $9,000 to be paid to the East Bay Municipal Utility District.

MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY AIR STATION, BEAUFORT, S. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item and give us the same information you have given with reference to the Naval Air Station at Alameda.

Admiral PERRY. The next station is the Marine Corps auxiliary air station at Beaufort, S. C.

The current planning calls for the establishment at Beaufort, S. C., of an additional Marine Corps air station to accommodate the 3d Marine Air Wing. The proposed site at Beaufort was constructed for and operated as a naval air station during World War II. The sewage treatment plant utilized at that time is at present in a state of disrepair and the site interferes with proposed future construction such that rehabilitation of the existing plant to make it serve during an interim period, would be economically infeasible.

It is anticipated that presently authorized construction will provide essential facilities for the Marine Corps auxiliary air station operation and will be usably completed by about mid-1956, thereby permitting the phasing in at the station of personnel required for such operations. These personnel to be stationed at the activity during the initial period of the Marine Corps auxiliary air station operation will approximate 2,500 in number, and unless the proposed sewage treatment plant is authorized, the sewage generated will of necessity have to be discharged untreated into neighboring Albergotti Creek and Brickyard River. Discharge of raw sewage into these streams will aggravate an existing condition in the immediate vicinity of the town of Beaufort which has made it necessary to condemn certain areas for the commercial harvesting of shell fish. Furthermore, the discharge of such a large additional amount of raw sewage into the tidal waters around the town of Beaufort would undoubtedly cause nuisance and health hazard conditions.

The design of the proposed sewage treatment plant is based on its being the first independent half of a complete treatment plant ultimately to be constructed to handle 7,000 personnel. Thus, the proposed unit can be readily expanded at a later date to accommodate the full needs of a Marine Corps air station without interrupting the operation of the plant by simply duplicating units. The plant is to consist of primary settling, intermittent dosing of a standard rate trickling filter, secondary settling and chlorination. A separate floating cover heated digester, with drying beds is to be provided for handling the sludge. Accordingly, the required budget estimate of $304,000 has been based upon providing one-half of a 7,000-man capacity sewage treatment plant which will provide the primary settling, a secondary settling and chlorination, and secondary treatment of a sludge by means of a heated digester.

(The following data on other projects is as follows:)

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AIR STATION, BRUNSWICK, MAINE

Construct a plant for primary sewage treatment based on a population of 4,000 with provision for expansion as well as secondary treatment if and when required. This plant will include new force main from existing pumping station to the new treatment plant, sedimentation tank, sludge digestion tank, pumphouse, chlorination and metering house, slude beds, gravity outfall to Androscoggin River and necessary utilities and collateral equipment.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, CHERRY POINT, N. C.

This project is for the authorization and appropriation of $115,000 for waste treatment plant to be located on Sandy Branch in the vicinity of A Street and Curtiss Road. All industrial wastes from buildings Nos. 133 and 137 will be intercepted at the new plant, settled and treated for the various chemicals and redischarged into the stream. The plant will be sized for dry weather flows. The higher flows resulting from rains collected in the combined industrial and storm drains will provide sufficient dilution to make treatment unnecessary. The plant will bypass the storm runoff. The treatment plant will consist of settling basins, aerator, detention tank, clarifier and sludge disposal field. A two-story building will be provided to house the chemical feeders and chemical storage.

The 2 settling tanks will be reinforced concrete 20 feet square and 10 feet deep. Flow-through capacity will be 257,000 gallons in an 8-hour day based on a minimum retention time of 1½ hours. The effluent from the settling tanks will be pumped consecutively through an aerator, detention tank, and clarifier. A pump will be provided to transfer the sludge from the tanks to a drying bed containing approximately 1,000 feet of underdrains. The tanks will have mechanical equipment for collecting the sludge. A 2-story chemical building 30 by 50 feet will be provided to house chemical feeders, meters, chlorinators, and chemicals on the second floor. The building will be all concrete construction with the second floor capable of carrying up to 500 pounds per square foot. Metering and sampling devices will be provided and automatic controls to regulate the chemical feeds consistent with the variation in flow of wastes. Water, sewage, electric, and steam services will be furnished. The existing storm drains will be extended to meet the new construction.

There is no requirement for acquisition of additional land for this project.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, FORT MIFFLIN, PA.

(*a*) This project is for the installation of a 10-inch cast iron sewer main from the depot to one of the city of Philadelphia's sewage system disposal plants and the necessary collection system and lift stations within the depot.

(*b*) No land acquisition is required but it will be necessary to obtain 6,000 feet of right-of-way for the force main to the city's plant. No charge is anticipated for this easement.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE SHIPYARD, KEARNY, N. J.

Work includes reconstructing the deteriorated on-station sewage collection system ($1,600,000), thereby eliminating septic tanks and outfalls therefrom which discharge into the Hackensack River. This project also includes payment to the Town of Kearny, N. J., for a connection ($430,000) from the on-station collection system to the municipal sewage disposal system. No additional land is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

(*a*) Construct a sewage pumping station at the northwest corner of naval station property and 12-inch cast-iron force main to deliver sewage from naval station and naval shipyard to city treatment plant. The pumping station will consist of a building with suction and pump wells, 2 sewage pumps (650 gallons per minute, nonclog type, maximum 85-foot head) with electrical controls. The force main to the city of Los Angeles treatment plant will be approximately 7,300 feet long. The proposed system will have a force main capable of handling mobilization sewage flow (1,476,000 gallons per day with a peak flow of 4.10 cubic feet per second for a duration of 1.5 hours), and the sewage pumping facilities will be capable of future expansion to handle mobilization flow.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, LOUISVILLE, KY.

(*a*) The construction of a plating equipment waste disposal plant capable of treating 50 gallons per minute of cyanide and 100 gallons per minute of chromic acid. This will consist of the necessary assembly of mixing tanks, settling tank, and other appurtenances occupying an area of 95 feet long by 25 feet wide plus a 3-story 20 by 30 foot concrete and brick control house.

(*b*) The construction of a waste oil separation unit capable of handling 1,600 gallons per minute of combined sanitary sewage and waste sewage and waste oil. This will consist of a reinforced concrete 81 by 43 foot divided separation chamber together with necessary equipment plus a 1-story 12 by 20 foot reinforced concrete and brick control house.

(*c*) The construction of a waste oil burning facility with a capacity of burning 95 gallons per hour of unreclaimable separated oil and other unreclaimable waste oil. This will consist of a 1-story 22 by 30 foot concrete and brick incinerator building complete with necessary equipment.

(*d*) The facilities noted above are listed in order of their urgency and are each a complete and operable increment of the system any one of which may be accomplished with benefit to the station, however, to eliminate illegal pollution of the Louisville sewage system, the complete system should be built at this time.

(*e*) This project does not require the acquisition of any real estate.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL SHIPYARD, MARE ISLAND, CALIF.

The project is for construction of interceptor sewers, force mains, pumping plants, sewage treatment plant and outfall. The collection system will consist of a main interceptor sewer along Railroad Avenue, approximately 3½ miles long and varying in size from 8 to 24 inches; a north interceptor sewer system, consisting of gravity lines, force mains and pump stations to deliver the sewage north of A Street to the main pumping plant at intersection of Railroad Avenue and A Street; and a south interceptor sewer system, consisting of gravity lines, force mains and pump stations to deliver the sewage south of A Street to the main pumping plant at intersection of Railroad Avenue and A Street. The north system will serve Guadalcanal Village, radio station, and north area of shipyard. The south system will serve the ammunition depot, naval hospital marine barracks, Iwo Village and south area of shipyard. There will be a total of nine pump stations.

The large pump stations will each have 3 pumps with sufficient capacity so that 2 pumps can handle the peak flow. The small pump stations will have two pumps, each capable of handling the peak flow. Sewage will be pumped from station 4A, located at intersection of Railroad Avenue and A Street, through a 20-inch force main approximately 4,600 feet long to the sewage treatment plant, which will be located on a 5-acre site on the west side of Mare Island north of A Street. The treatment plant will be of the primary type, consisting of bar screens, grit chambers, preaeration and sedimentation tanks, separate sludge digestors, sludge drying beds, and laboratory and control building. Effluent from the plant will be discharged through a 24-inch gravity outfall approximately 1,000

feet long to San Pablo Bay, which has high dilution capacity. Industrial sewage will be pretreated by various methods, depending upon the type thereof, prior to entering the sewers. Since large parts of Mare Island have been built up by depositing dredged material, a considerable portion of the interceptor sewers and the treatment plant structures will have to be supported on piles. No additional land is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

(*a*) The type of plant proposed is the biooxidation type. The plant consists of a grit separator, bar screen and comminutor, two oxidators placed in parallel, two digesters, one having a floating cover and one having a gas holder type cover, a heat exchanger, control house, chlorination facilities, gas control equipment for utilizing the gas and gas burner for burning waste gas, oxidation lagoons and sludge beds. This type of plant will provide an effluent from the oxidators having 65 to 75 percent reduction in suspended solids and 5-day BOD. With this reduction the effluent from the lagoons should be supersaturated with oxygen and entirely free from disease bearing organisms normally found in sewage.

(*b*) The existing Imhoff tanks will be broken down to 6 feet below grade, filled and abandoned.

(*c*) No land acquisition is necessary.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: NAVAL BASE, NEWPORT, R. I.

The facilities to be constructed under this increment and the number of personnel presently stationed at each activity are as follows. The facilities will be constructed in such manner to maintain all components in a state of readiness and in consonance with the master development plan of the base.

Location and facilities:	*Number of personnel*
1. Naval underwater ordnance station and marine barracks (Gravity sewer, pumping station, and force main)	2,100
2. Naval net depot and supply area, Melville (septic tanks, interceptors, and outfall)	260
3. Trailer housing, Melville, R. I., (preliminary settling tank, chlorination, and outfall)	1,500
4. Housing at Midway Station, (small septic tanks and outfall)	40
5. Ordnance area, Prudence Island, (large septic tank and chlorination)	60
6. Ordnance test area, Gould Island (septic tanks and outfall)	350
7. Quarters area and active facilities, Goat Island (septic tanks, chlorination, and outfall)	500
8. Fleet wharf area, Newport, R. I. (two septic tanks and outfall)	(1)
9. Government landing, Newport, R. I. (septic tank and outfall)	(1)

[1] Transient.

Sewage from the above facilities is now discharged into the bay without treatment.

The project will be constructed in its entirety on Navy-owned land. No land acquisition is required.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, NORFOLK, VA.

This project consists of the construction of a total of 10,601 lineal feet of sewers including 6-inch service connections, 8-inch clay and cast-iron branch sewers, and 10-inch cast-iron sewers, together with 28 manholes and incidental related work. The sanitary sewer collected in this system will be discharged directly into a pumping station already constructed by the Department of the Army as a part of its share in the combined facility. From this pumping station it is conveyed in a common trunk sewer already constructed by the Army into the system of the Hampton Roads Sanitation District Commission. The common trunk sewer and the sewage pumping station referred to possess adequate capacity for handling the increase flow of sewage which will result when this project is completed, having been designed by the District Engineer's Office on the basis of the service demands for the entire station, including the portion occupied by the Naval Supply Center. No additional land is required.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION NAVAL FUEL SUPPLY DEPOT, PORT MOLATE RICHMOND, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIF.

This project consists of an Imhoff tank (on concrete piles) designed for 25,000 gallons per day average flow with 2½ hours detention; two sludge drying beds 16 x 18 feet each; a collection system of 8-inch sewer pipes and 6-inch laterals; five (5) septic tanks in the outlying areas; pumps, motors, and appurtenances.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVY MINE COUNTERMEASURES STATION, PANAMA CITY, FLA.

The project is for the construction of a sanitary collection system consisting of approximately 8,000 linear feet of sewer mains and laterals, lift station, and treatment plant to provide both primary and secondary treatment. Components of the treatment plant, consist of grinder, screen, primary settling tank, trickling filter, secondary settling tanks, sludge digestor, sludge drying beds, chlorine chamber, control building, and pump. The treatment plant provides for an estimated population of 2,000 persons.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLA.

(*a*) The acids and cyanides will be collected individually and dumped by gravity into the treatment tanks, where the acids will be neutralized with rock lime and the cyanides reduced by chlorination. Treated liquid and sludge will then go to the lift station wet well. The lift station pumps will discharge through a force main to the existing sewage treatment plant outfall line, bypassing the plant. No additional land is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL SHIPYARD, PUGET SOUND, BREMERTON, WASH.

A pressure sewage-collection system consisting of approximately 11,000 linear feet of 6- to 14-inch cast-iron pipe with 9 pump lift stations along the lowest elevations of the existing sewage system for raising sewage approximately 10 feet and delivering to the existing city of Bremerton sewage system for treatment. Sewage from the area of the shipyard west of drydock No. 3 will be delivered via force main and 8 lift stations to city of Bremerton Lift Station No. 7 west of shipyard. Sewage from area east of Drydock No. 3 will be delivered via force main and lift station to city of Bremerton Lift Station No. 6. No land acquisition is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AIR STATION, QUONSET POINT, R. I.

(*a*) Construct the following additions to the existing plant to serve a population of 16,000: two primary settling tanks, chlorination and metering building, together with necessary utilities and collateral.
(*b*) No land acquisition is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The cleaning, repairing, and painting of the existing equipment in a trickling filter sewage treatment plant. The remodeling of the sludge digestion tank, the installation of sludge heating and recirculating equipment and automatic chlorination equipment. The construction of new oxidation ponds to provide final treatment to the effluent.
(*a*) There will be no conflict or injurious effects of this project on any adjacent installation of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard.
(*b*) The construction covered in this project will not conflict with the proposed location of any project carried in the master shore station development plan and has taken into consideration the proposed future development in this area.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The project is for construction of approximately 11,000 lineal feet of sanitary sewer piping, 25 manholes and 1 concrete pumphouse and collection basin with two 50 gallons per minute sewage pumps to eliminate 16 sanitary sewer outfalls discharging raw sewage into San Diego Bay.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The project is for construction of a sewage-collection system, consisting of intercepter sewers, force main, and pumping station to deliver shipyard sewage to a city of San Francisco receiving manhole near the intersection of Palou Avenue and Griffith Street, at which point the sewage will be conveyed by existing city sewers to the city treatment plant. The collection system will consist of approximately 9,400 lineal feet of 6 to 12 inch gravity sewers; 10,000 lineal feet of 15 to 24 inch gravity sewers; 1,870 lineal feet of 33 inch gravity sewer; and 2,340 lineal feet of 24 inch cast-iron force main, including service connections, manholes, and diversion structures. The project includes a small pump station D, provided with a 100 gallons per minute pump and located in Solomon's village area, and pump station A, located on Spear Avenue, near building 808 and provided with 2 pumps each capable of delivering 5.5 million gallons of sewage per day at peak rate of flow. Provision is made in pump station A for installation of a future third pump of same capacity to handle mobilization flow of sewage.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: NAVAL RADIO STATION (R) SKAGGS ISLAND, SONOMA COUNTY, CALIF.

(*a*) Sewage treatment plant: Construct Imhoff tank having a 150,000 gallon per day capacity to serve 1,400 people including 2 pumping stations, 2 lift stations, and septic tank bypasses. No additional land is required.

(*b*) Storm drainage system:

(1) Construct a 1,500 gallons per minute pump station in the north drainage system including 4,400 feet of steel and concrete pipe with concrete catch basins.

(2) Construct a 1,500 gallons per minute pump station at the south end of drainage ditch with 130 feet of steel pipe. Regrade 1,200 feet of drainage ditch. Construct asphalt paved gutter and culvert. Disconnect and plug subsurface drains. No additional land is required.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, SOUTH CHARLESTON, W. VA.

(*a*) It is proposed to construct an interceptor sewer parallel to the Kanawha River intercepting all existing sanitary sewers on the naval ordnance plant. The sewage then is to be lifted into the sewer mains of the city of South Charleston with the necessary pumping stations and force mains being a part of this project. Provision is to be made to pass excessive storm runoff directly into the river. Design for this project is to be coordinated with the city of South Charleston to insure that the completed facility will be compatible with plans now being drawn up by that city for a new storm and sanitary sewer system. This project does not require the acquisition of any real estate.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL NET DEPOT, TIBURON, CALIF.

(*a*) Construct a sewage-disposal system to meet the needs of 260 people with provisions for expansion after mobilization.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: NAVAL AIR STATION, WHIDBEY ISLAND, WASH.

It is proposed to install a sewage treatment plant, including screening, sedimentation sludge digestion, and chlorination. The capacity of the plant will be 600,000 gallons per day providing a plant for 6,000 persons based on a per capita design figure of 100 gallons per day. The plant will be planned and designed to permit expansion, if necessary. This project has been coordinated with the Pollution Control Commission and the Department of Health of the State of Washington, and these local agencies have indicated the proposed facilities would receive their approval.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

BASIS FOR ESTIMATES

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the basis of the figures that you give us in your justifications?

Admiral PERRY. In the case of each of these 24 subprojects which compose the single project, they have been advance planned and I can furnish you with the information concerning the advance planning as we proceed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They were advance planned by private concerns, or by engineers?

Admiral PERRY. In some cases they have been advance planned in the offices of the district public works officers and in other cases by private engineers and architects.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will these subprojects, if approved, be built on the basis of competitive bids or on what basis?

Admiral PERRY. All of these projects, Mr. Wigglesworth, would be built according to plans and specifications which we would have drawn up and open and competitive bidding would take place before the contract was awarded.

NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE SHIPYARD, KEARNY, N. J.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice at the Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Kearny, N. J., you have an item of $430,000 as a connection charge to the town of Kearny, N. J.; $968,000 for on-station sewers; and $632,000 for piling, concrete pile caps, under drains, concrete cradle sheeting, and repaving, a total of $2,030,000. Why is there such a large amount involved in this project?

Admiral PERRY. The work here includes reconstructing the deteriorated onstation sewage collection system ($1,600,000), thereby eliminating septic tanks and outfalls therefrom which discharge into the Hackensack River. This project also includes payment to the Town of Kearny, N. J., for a connection ($430,000) from the onstation collection system to the municipal sewage disposal system.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, MARE ISLAND, CALIF.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about the Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif., where you want $6,210,000. That is also for sewage disposal; is it not?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I see you have nine pumping stations.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why is such a heavy expenditure required there?

Admiral PERRY. This project is for the construction of interceptor sewers, force mains, pumping plants, sewage treatment plant, and outfall. The collection system will consist of a main interceptor sewer along Railroad Avenue, approximately 3½ miles long and varying in size from 8 inches to 24 inches; a north interceptor sewer system, consisting of gravity lines, force mains, and pump stations to deliver the sewage north of A Street to the main pumping plant at intersection of Railroad Avenue and A Street; and a south interceptor sewer system, consisting of gravity lines, force mains, and pump stations to deliver the sewage south of A Street to the main pumping plant at intersection of Railroad Avenue and A Street. The north system will serve Guadalcanal Village, radio station, and north area of shipyard. The south system will serve the ammunition depot, naval

hospital, Marine barracks, Iwo Village, and south area of shipyard. Because of the size of this system, nine pumping stations will be required in order to insure that the sewage which is to be handled will be handled properly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This justification indicates that the—

Regional Water Pollution Control Board No. 2 of the State of California on 21 October, 1954, passed a resolution which found that a condition of pollution and nuisance exists in Mare Island Strait due to discharge of raw sewage from naval activities on Mare Island and which prescribes standards to be maintained in the receiving waters.

That, I assume, is one reason for the proposed work here?

Admiral PERRY. That is one of the reasons; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Chair would like to ask if it is not a fact the Navy has received complaint not only at that particular location relative to violations of pollution control regulations but has received a series of others geographically speaking, have you not?

Admiral PERRY. We have received any number.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Although the gentleman's question has been predicated upon that particular location, it is not an isolated condition pertaining to sewage.

Admiral PERRY. No, sir, it is not. As a matter of fact, one of the first States to get after us was the State of Rhode Island about the pollution which we caused in Narragansett Bay.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I note that for the Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, you want $1,435,000 and you state that the city of San Francisco and the Government have reached an agreement pertaining to pollution control whereby the State will treat sewage from the shipyard in both peacetime and mobilization and, if a separate sewage-dispotal plant were to be constructed at the shipyard, it would add approximately $700,000 to the cost of this project, in addition to which the operating and maintenance cost would have to be borne by the Government.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Wigglesworth, that statement is made to show why we are trying to tie into the city of San Francisco system, rather than build our own treatment plant.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Admiral, I, for one, want to applaud the Navy and I heartily approve this program which I understand calls for the treating of, and the elimination of, pollution in our waters throughout the continental United States. I, for one, have been fairly close to the problem as a State official, rather than as a Member of Congress, and I have always felt it is unfair for the Federal Government, whether it be the military or other Federal agencies, to expect municipalities and private industries to eliminate and control pollution when the Federal Government was unable or unwilling to meet this responsibility.

SOURCE OF AND AUTHORITY FOR POLLUTION PROGRAM

I would like to ask this question about the overall program. Did this program, which I understand is brought about by virtue of an Executive order in the light of Public Law 845 of the 80th Congress,

and which set forth the policy of pollution abatement—did this program stem from any Defense Department directive or other means of instruction which might be equally applicable to all of the services, or is this a program that the Navy has taken cognizance of and is dealing with without regard to any overall defense program?

Bear in mind, I approve these projects and your recommendations, but I am interested to learn whether our Military Establishment has a coordinated program? To make my point: Why should the Navy act in this manner on the one hand and the Army, right alongside of one of these projects, continue to pollute the same stream?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, I would have to supply the answer to that question for the record, in view of the fact I am not familiar with the procedures which are presently followed by the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think, however, that the gentleman's question might be resolved to the degree of whether an official order came down to the Navy for these corrective procedures.

Admiral PERRY. We were told to include these items as urgent items in this year's request for appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But there was a memorandum specifically directing it as such; is that correct?

Admiral CLARK. No official communication.

Admiral PERRY. We were told to in the Navy. Now, whether that came from higher authority than the Secretary of the Navy, I cannot say. I got my instructions from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The reason I asked my question was that a memorandum of that character did come down. The memorandum, within itself, might have been addressed to all services?

Admiral PERRY. I am sure I can find the answer to Mr. Ostertag's question.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am interested to know and, if you have the answer, I would appreciate its being inserted at this point in the record.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. The basic Navy authority for its present pollution abatement program is Executive Order 10014. Department of Defense and Secretary of the Navy directives did not instruct the Navy to formulate this program. Formerly, these projects were sponsored by the individual sponsoring agencies. Since these projects cannot compete with the military necessity of the sponsors' other projects, they were deleted from previous programs before submission to the Congress. Therefore, the Navy considered that the most feasible means for bringing these to the attention of the Congress was by compiling a packaged pollution abatement program.

Admiral CLARK. The Army has started on the same program and in theirs last year they had some of these, and I believe this. I just happened to see the Army hearing where they were presenting some last year and I am quite sure it was done by discussion between the three services and the Secretary of Defense's Office and they agreed on what the Navy should put in. Whether it was a formal directive, we will have to get for the record.

Mr. OSTERTAG. How do you people determine just which installations or facilities are to receive funds in connection with pollution abatement? What I am getting at is this: Is there any yardstick by which you measure the need as, for example, the difference between

what might be termed "a permanent installation" as compared with one which might not be permanent?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir; at the beginning of this year, the Board of which I am the senior member, the Shore Station Development Board, held discussions on this subject with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations and the Secretary of the Navy's Office to get a determination as to how much of a survey was required on this advance planning program, and we were to screen all of the stations to see whether it was a permanent station, whether the number of personnel was going to increase or decrease. In other words, it might be, if the place was being radically reduced, that they could handle it although it was a violation of law at these installations. Each of these has been heard in detail by the Board of which I was senior member, and the Board of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Right along that line, if you do the planning for these projects, will this $15,149,000 include funds for planning?

Admiral CLARK. The Bureau of Yards and Docks do that out of their own planning money.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This budget request is for $15,149,000. Would you say that this amount will complete the task of pollution abatement here in the United States insofar as the Navy is concerned?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; it will not.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Are there other locations that are in dire need of pollution control?

Admiral CLARK. Not dire need. We put all of the dire needs in this year. If it was a borderline case, or a case where we could say the future construction was definitely going to require it far into the future, we deferred it; because we did not think we could afford to incur the expense. But the ones we could see were going to be built up in the near future, like the Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station, where people are definitely going to be phased in there this year, then we asked for it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Under your estimated future appropriation requirements you list $4,385,000. Is that intended to mean the projects that are not considered urgent, or does that mean funds to complete this job?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Ostertag, that includes provision of sewage disposal, or sewage treatment—whichever term you wish to use—facilities at 8 stations in addition to these 24. We feel after those eight stations have been programed the program will be complete.

Now the eight stations that have been put forward for future work, in many cases—take the Naval Shipyard at Brooklyn, N. Y., there is pollution of the waters there presently, not by our own choosing, but we add to that pollution: we felt because the waters of the East River, and so forth, are polluted anyway, it could be deferred. Our program is that much further in the future. So you have eight stations which we estimate will cost $4,385,000 to wipe out our entire program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Did the Interstate Sanitation Commission work with you on the problem involving the Navy's pollution of the East River?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir; they did.

Mr. OSTERTAG. One more question, and this has to do with these projects: Do you have any situations where a combination or joint project with, let us say, a municipality or adjacent industries, would be the feasible means of pollution control? How do you deal with a problem of that kind?

Admiral PERRY. Let us take the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. Of course, that is some years old. What we did there, instead of building our own sewage treatment plant, we actually provided funds to the municipality of Annapolis, Md., to aid them in the construction of a sewage treatment plant and we had an agreement with them whereby it would be of such a size and such character that it would take all of the sewage from the Naval Academy and we would pay them so much per thousand gallons for sewage we dumped in there. We have meters on the line that tie in from the Naval Academy into the main going through Annapolis and into the sewage treatment plant. I used that as an example to show you that in any of our plans, if it is feasible to go in and use facilities of the local community, or help them expand their facilities, we will do so.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In all cases, I take it, in representing the Navy and the United States Government, you see that these joint propositions and negotiations are reasonable? By virtue of the fact you are representing the National Government is no reason why the Federal Government or the Navy should pay an unfair portion of the cost and assume a greater degree of responsibility than normally belonged to the Federal Government.

Admiral PERRY. In any case we make an economic study of the case in question to determine whether it is more economical for the Federal Government to put up its own sewage treatment plant, or whether you can save money by going to a joint use of a plant of the municipality or political area which adjoins it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In appropriating this $15 million plus, do you have complete jurisdiction and authority to enter into any kind of agreement you find to be feasible, practical, and proper?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, you have unlimited authority to negotiate and enter into agreements with municipalities, private corporations, and others, to achieve the purpose indicated here?

Admiral PERRY. When I say "we," I refer to the Secretary of the Navy, of course. He does possess that authority.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—CONTINENTAL AND OVERSEAS

CORRECTION OF DEFICIENCIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up the next item entitled "Various locations continental and overseas. Correction of deficiencies," wherein you are asking for $6 million.

I would like to have a definition of your "correction of deficiencies" before you go into the explanation.

Admiral CLARK. These are funds for the restoration or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed, continental and overseas. This item is "insurance" to take care of damage to Naval and Marine Corps facilities caused by periodic typhoons, and tidal waves in the Pacific, earthquakes, conflagrations, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many projects are involved?

Admiral CLARK. We won't know until we see how many typhoons we have. We used up last year's money for the State of Massachusetts tornado and Hurricane Hazel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This, ten, is not for already established requirements, but is for contemplated requirements?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this $6 million is the anticipated expenditure due to the elements, and so forth?

Admiral CLARK. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much was appropriated last year for this same purpose?

Admiral CLARK. Two and a half million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And how much has been expended or allocated?

Admiral CLARK. That is a continuing fund. It was added to the funds previously on hand which we get from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. I am sure we used more than the two and a half million last year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What we are trying to establish here is what you received last year and what additional funds you had when you got the new money that were unobligated and unexpended.

Admiral CLARK. Admiral Perry will give you that information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Answer the question as to the money first.

Admiral PERRY. Last year we received $2.5 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of a carryover, unexpended and unobligated, and so forth, free money, was added to that $2.5 million?

Admiral PERRY. Then we added the $2.5 million to that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What was the carryover?

Admiral PERRY. I will have to supply that for the record. The sheet I have before me does not give that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Surely somebody must know how much you had available in 1955; otherwise you would not be in here asking for $6 million.

Admiral PERRY. The uncommitted balance before the last Congress was absolutely zero.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you started the last fiscal year with an appropriation of $2.5 million.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of that $2.5 million has been expended as of the latest date, or allocated?

Admiral PERRY. We have presently uncommitted, and this is as of April 1, $9,148.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you put in a list of the allocations made in the last fiscal year, please?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

(The list is as follows:)

Public works, Navy—Funds allocated for correction of deficiencies during fiscal year 1955—Obligations as of May 31, 1955

Allotment No.	Station and location	Purpose for which allotment was issued	Date allotment issued	Amount of allotment	Obligations through May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
40084	NAF, Weeksville, N. C	Damages, Hurricane Hazel	Nov. 16, 1954	$19,500.00	$18,092.19	$1,407.81
40085	NAAS, Fentress, Va	do	do	10,800.00	7,859.69	2,940.31
40086	NAS, Norfolk, Va	do	do	86,100.00	80,567.14	5,532.86
40087	MCB, Camp Le Jeune, N. C	do	do	188,400.00	139,475.44	48,924.56
40088	NAF, Anacostia, Washington, D. C	do	do	8,000.00		
			Jan. 25, 1955	1,663.00		
				9,663.00	9,663.00	0
40089	NSY, Philadelphia, Pa	do	Nov. 16, 1954	55,000.00	52,840.04	2,159.96
40090	NEES, Annapolis, Md	do	Mar. 2, 1955	3,600.00	3,600.00	0
40091	N and MC RTC, Providence, R. I	do	Mar. 24, 1955	16,642.00	16,642.00	0
40083	Camp Pendleton (Pickel Meadows) Oceanside, Calif.	Multipurpose building destroyed by fire	Sept. 1, 1954	34,744.00	34,744.00	0
71040	NCS, Pearl Harbor, T. H	Damage caused by wind and rainstorm of Nov. 28–29, 1954.	Mar. 24, 1955	45,000.00	44,490.00	510.00
71041	NSY, Pearl Harbor, T. H	do	do	38,000.00	37,599.40	400.60
71042	NAD, Oahu, T. H	do	do	48,069.00	48,069.00	0
15026	NAS, South Weymouth, Mass	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Sept. 23, 1954	64,500.00	52,242.98	12,257.02
15027	NSD, Newport, R. I	do	do	151,500.00	116,018.05	35,481.95
15028	Underwater ordnance station, Newport, R. I	do	do	88,000.00	72,439.18	15,560.82
15029	NSY, Boston, Mass	do	do	192,800.00	180,688.15	12,111.85
15030	East Boston Fuel Annex, Boston, Mass	do	do	33,979.00	33,979.00	0
15031	NSY, Portsmouth, N. H	do	do	96,300.00	91,012.89	5,287.11
15033	NRTC, Fall River, Mass	do	do	1,792.25	1,792.25	0
15042	NAAS, Chincoteague, Va	Damage, Hurricane Hazel	Nov. 16, 1954	45,100.00	38,300.33	6,799.67
15045	NAOTS, Chincoteague, Va	do	do	67,500.00	47,491.73	20,008.27
15043	CinLant, Norfolk, Va	do	do	7,200.0	7,200.00	
15044	NAS, Patuxent River, Md	do	do	120,500.00	116,961.42	3,538.58
15051	Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyard, East Boston, Mass.	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Dec. 29, 1954	17,500.00	0	17,500.00
			June 1, 1955	4,650.00	0	4,650.00
				22,150.00	0	22,150.00
15052	NRTC, Providence, R. I	do	Jan. 4, 1955	47,936.00	47,936.00	0
15062	NEES, Annapolis, Md	Damage, Hurricane Hazel	Mar. 2, 1955	10,200.00	10,200.00	0
15069	NAD, Oahu, T. H	Wind and rainstorm damage, Nov. 28–29, 1954	Mar. 4, 1955	169,609.00	169,609.00	0
16280	NAS, Quonset Point, R. I	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Sept. 23, 1954	840,128.00	792,542.14	47,585.86
16281	NCBC, Davisville, R. I	do	do	374,500.00	361,923.75	12,576.25
16282	NS, Newport, R. I	do	do	631,000.00	473,314.90	157,685.10
16283	HDU, Newport, R. I	do	do	22,300.00	17,742.19	4,557.81
16284	NRC, Portsmouth, N. H	do	do	42,500.00	35,526.01	6,973.99
16285	NUSL, New London, Conn	do	do	357,000.00	308,288.57	48,711.43
16287	MCAS, Cherry Point, N. C	Damage, Hurricane Hazel	Nov. 16, 1954	97,709.00	77,727.39	19,981.61
16288	NTC, Bainbridge, Md	do	do	12,500.00	11,934.72	565.28
16289	NAD, St. Juliens Creek, Portsmouth, Va	do	do	131,700.00	127,053.55	4,646.45
16290	NAS, South Weymouth, Mass	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Dec. 29, 1954	5,000.00	5,000.00	0

Public works, Navy—Funds allocated for correction of deficiencies during fiscal year 1955—Obligations as of May 31, 1955—Continued

Allotment No.	Station and location	Purpose for which allotment was issued	Date allotment issued	Amount of allotment	Obligations through May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
16292	Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyard, East Boston, Mass.	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Dec. 29, 1954	$29,000.00	0	$29,000.00
16535	NRTC, Providence, R. I.	do	Jan. 4, 1955	27,700.00	$27,700.00	0
16537	NSY, Boston, Mass.	do	Feb. 14, 1955	47,000.00	47,000.00	0
16538	NEES, Annapolis, Md.	Damage, Hurricane Hazel	Mar. 2, 1955	7,300.00	7,300.00	0
15068	NAD, Oahu, T. H.	Wind and rainstorm damage, Nov. 28–29, 1954	Mar. 24, 1955	322,825.00	322,825.00	
19037	NND, Melville, R. I.	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Sept. 23, 1954	391,382.00	318,382.00	73,000.00
19038	NCS, Squantum, Mass.	do	Nov. 23, 1954	12,700.00	12,700.00	0
19039	NAS, South Weymouth, Mass.	do	Sept. 23, 1954	17,937.15	17,937.15	0
19040	SB, New London, Conn.	do	do	84,000.00	79,036.77	4,963.23
19041	OL, Woods Hole, Mass.	do	do	7,770.00	7,770.00	0
19042	NRTC, Providence, R. I.	do	do	111,426.00	102,426.00	9,000.00
19091	NA, Annapolis, Md.	do	Nov. 1, 1954	238,400.00	216,097.98	22,302.02
19093	NAS, Oceania, Va.	Damage, Hurricane Hazel	Nov. 16, 1954	28,500.00	22,315.85	6,184.15
19094	NSC, Norfolk, Va.	do	do	376,700.00	330,669.95	46,030.05
19095	PWC, Norfolk, Va.	do	do	118,000.00	53,318.91	64,681.09
19096	MCFD, Portsmouth, Va.	do	do	27,000.00	24,187.71	2,812.29
19097	FADTC, Dam Neck, Va.	do	do	61,800.00	61,431.41	368.59
19098	NAB, Little Creek, Va.	do	do	46,100.00	38,098.83	8,001.17
19099	AFSC, Norfolk, Va.	do	do	55,100.00	50,203.19	4,896.81
19100	NMD, Yorktown, Va.	do	do	70,500.00	61,833.25	8,666.75
19102	NSMW, Yorktown, Va.	do	do	12,500.00	11,354.77	1,145.23
19103	NSY, Portsmouth, Va.	do	do	139,000.00	72,302.87	66,697.13
19104	FMF, Norfolk, Va.	do	do	9,300.00	9,300.00	0
19105	NS, Norfolk, Va.	do	do	98,500.00	38,830.24	59,669.76
19106	NOLTF, Fort Monroe, Va.	do	do	1,426.00	1,426.00	0
19107	NEES, Annapolis, Md.	do	do	63,000.00	38,227.07	24,772.93
19108	NAF, Annapolis, Md.	do	do	19,600.00	19,475.69	124.31
19109	NPG, Dahlgren, Va.	do	do	31,146.00	27,394.99	3,751.01
19110	NRL, Anacostia, D. C.	do	do	18,500.00	14,757.42	3,742.58
19111	MCS, Quantico, Va.	do	do	10,000.00	100,000.00	0
19112	NAD, Fort Mifflin, Philadelphia, Pa.	do	do	15,000.00	9,190.00	5,810.00
19113	NS, Annapolis, Md.	do	do	5,500.00	5,075.95	424.05
19114	NRS, Annapolis, Md.	do	do	6,000.00	5,975.86	24.14
19118	NSY, Brooklyn, N. Y.	{Replacement of MOQ destroyed by explosion {Collateral equipment	Nov. 22, 1954 Dec. 13, 1954	14,040.00 3,600.00	13,875.00 1,312.50	
				17,640.00	15,187.50	2,452.50
19129	Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyard, East Boston, Mass.	Damage, Hurricane Carol	Dec. 29, 1954	74,469.00	0	74,469.00

19131	NIRGP, Lynn, Mass.	do	do	14,700.00	14,700.00	0
19189	Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyard, East Boston and NIRSY, Hingham, Mass.	do	Apr. 4, 1955	20,876.00	20,876.00	0
19181	NS, Green Cove Springs, Fla.	To repair administration building damaged by fire	Mar. 23, 1955	45,000.00	44,185.15	814.85
19182	NS, Key West, Fla.	Floor damage repairs, caused by rain and high wind	do	138,200.00	127,023.71	11,176.29
19168	NAD, Oahu, T. H.	Repair damage caused by wind and rainstorm	Mar. 24, 1955	97,697.00	97,697.00	0
19169	PWC, Pearl Harbor, T. H.	do	Mar. 23, 1955	86,680.00	51,431.17	35,248.83
	Total			7,194,795.40	6,126,211.49	1,068,583.91

Admiral CLARK. I wonder if you were using both continental and overseas, Admiral Perry? Last year, as I remember, it was broken down into two requests, one for continental and one for overseas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was directed to a combination of continental and overseas, in order to bring the two figures on a comparable basis of understanding. And, if you find the answer you have given as to your balance is in error, correct the record when it comes down to you; because I am addressing myself to both continental and overseas.

Admiral PERRY. The balance for both of them combined is $9,148.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If I understand what you have said, you had $4 million available in the two funds for fiscal 1955; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And of that $4 million, $9,148 was unobligated as of April 1, 1955.

Admiral PERRY. Uncommitted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How much was obligated?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Wigglesworth, I am not a bookkeeper. The bookkeeper uses different terms. In other words, until the money is actually under contract, it is not an obligation according to the bookkeeper; but when I allot money to a station to correct a deficiency such as that caused by Hurricanes Carol and Hazel, it is automatically taken off of my books; so the money remaining on my books is $9,148.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I wish you would also supply for the record the figure for the unobligated balance as of the latest date you can furnish.

Admiral PERRY. We can do that.

(The information furnished is as follows:)

The unobligated balance in the "Correction of deficiencies," is $1,068,000 (approximately) as of May 31, 1955.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The funds made available for this purpose lapse with the fiscal year, do they not?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They are no-year funds.

Admiral PERRY. They are no-year funds. Any remaining balance is added to whatever is appropriated by the present Congress.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you have available the record which shows the accumulated funds?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What is that amount?

Admiral CLARK. I do not have that here.

Admiral PERRY. Beginning with the 80th Congress, you have appropriated for both continental and overseas combined $15,250,000.

Admiral CLARK. And from that you have remaining a balance of $9,148 uncommitted.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral, this money is figured on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. You do not spend it until the damage is done; you do not make any future contracts; you just try to restore the damage that occurs overnight so to speak?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Wigglesworth, in many cases we defer repairing, let us say, fire damage because we cannot foresee what might happen in the last 6 months of the year and if we spent all of the money the first 6 months and have another Hurricane Hazel, or something like that, we would have absolutely no money to take care of absolutely urgent requirements. So we tend to mother the fund, shall I say, until toward the end of the year and do only the essential work, whether the damage be caused by fire, tornado, hurricane, or what.

Mr. ANDREWS. This fund is comparable to a petty cash advance.

Admiral PERRY. Some of this fund; that is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I want to make sure I have it clear. From the beginning in the year 1948, did you say?

Admiral PERRY. The 80th Congress.

Mr. OSTERTAG. From the beginning of the 80th Congress, some $15 million has been appropriated for this type of contingency?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Of which you have obligated or spent practically all of it but $9,000?

Admiral PERRY. $9,148; yes, sir.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Therefore, there is no balance and this would be new money to meet new contingencies?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What happens when you have to go into your maintenance money, as against money that would be logically classified for expenditure for the purposes we have presently reviewed? It would be an emergency, I assume, wherein you would use maintenance money; but somewhere along the line there is a line of demarcation.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The point I have in mind is the fact we have been rather conservative in your maintenance money. I am speaking about Congress over the period of time that I have been associated with it.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And if you find a situation beyond your control, to the degree you have to use maintenance money, is that money repaid from this emergency fund into the maintenance fund, or is it not? What I am getting at is, does the maintenance capability under appropriations that are granted become a deficiency situation because money is expended for an emergency purpose?

Admiral PERRY. I can only speak with respect to one appropriation, and that is the appropriation "Civil engineering, Navy," because that is the only appropriation with which I deal. That appropriation is in general not used for a majority of the stations throughout either the United States or overseas. In other words, I can only speak——

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Yards and Docks point of view.

Admiral PERRY. In a very narrow field. And we make no attempt to reimburse the appropriation "Civil engineering, Navy," which is used for maintenance purposes, if some of those funds are used of necessity for "correction of deficiencies."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am addressing my next comment to the Comptroller of the Navy and I will ask you, Admiral Smith, to provide a statement in the record at this point showing to what degree, if any, the services of the Navy have expended their maintenance fund to cover what is here expressed as emergency fund requirements.

Admiral SMITH. I will provide that for the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And if they have expended those funds, has the maintenance fund been reimbursed by the emergency fund?

Admiral SMITH. I can state that definitely now, sir. They are not transferable. If maintenance funds are used, they are not reimbursed from the public works emergency fund.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, then, the committee of Congress is not kept conversant with the literal expenditure of the maintenance funds, are they? I am not criticizing the necessity of using funds in emergencies; but, if that fund is not reimbursed, then obviously the maintenance fund that is allocated by appropriations of Congress has a deficiency some place in it if any portion of the maintenance fund is picked up and applied to the emergency appropriation.

Admiral SMITH. To the degree maintenance funds have been used, that is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to have a complete report as to how much and when that has occurred in the past 2 fiscal years, from all Departments of the Navy.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

(The information requested is being supplied to the committee.)

VARIOUS LOCATIONS—ADVANCE PLANNING

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are no further questions, we will proceed to the next item which is entitled "Various Locations—Advance Planning," wherein by Public Law 155 of the 82d Congress you were authorized and are asking for $15 million.

I would like an explanation for the requirements of advance planning and upon what premise the total amount of $15 million was arrived at and what period did you use to estimate the figure of $15 million.

Admiral PERRY. As has been explained in previous testimony, the preparation of advance plans or the performance of advance planning on any project will run anywhere from one-half percent to 1 percent. In some cases it might even exceed 1 percent if you had an extensive field investigation to make; but three-quarters of a percent is a good average figure for an example.

If we are to come before you gentlemen with proper advance planning of a program of $200 million or $400 million, you can see we would require three-quarters of 1 percent, at least, to properly prepare the advance planning for that program. Now if we take three-quarters of 1 percent, let us say, of $400 million—and in this particular year it was much more than that—you can see you would get $3 million.

I have explained to you gentlemen, I think, that if we are not to carry over tremendous amounts of money at the end of the fiscal year, we must do a certain amount of detailed plans and specifications for projects which you have under consideration ahead of the appropriation, or we would lose at least 6 to 8 months in the fiscal year in which we have no chance to obligate any money.

We need at least $3 million to $4 million for the strictly advance planning and that is what you see written in here. We need the rest of it to prepare the detailed plans and specifications so that we can carry out, I think, the intent of Congress and get this money obligated on time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that is quite true and I think your explanation is compatible with what you have said heretofore. I do believe, however, in your presentation as in the printed document, it would not have been completely explanatory because here it is confined strictly to advance planning in a total of $15 million. At least, that is the way it is expressed here. And I do not contemplate you will utilize the entire $15 million exclusively for advance planning. Am I wrong in my concept?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir. If you will note, in that statement it says: "Adequate funds are required to provide schematics and estimates for projects to be submitted in future public-works programs, and in some cases to provide contract drawings and specifications." I did not go into the details, or the detail was not gone into when this thing was written that I have given you in my short dissertation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The thing that prompted my interrogation, of course, is not only what has been said by yourself, but I quote from a paragraph in Secretary Fogler's statement that "In 1956 we are requesting $15 million for advance planning. This sum will permit us to advance plan a somewhat larger program for 1957; to develop final plans and specifications for the most urgent long-lead-time projects in the 1957 program; and to begin preliminary engineering and evaluation of projects which will be proposed as part of the 1958 program. I particularly urge your favorable consideration for this item."

In other words his statement is all inclusive as to the complete planning aspect; yet your justifications appear to deal purely with the advance planning category, which is likely to lead to confusion.

When you set up a detail of that character, it would seem to me you should be very careful to state it is to carry out advance planning and the other aspect of expenditures reflected under advance planning in this instance of $15 million.

Admiral PERRY. I think your point is well taken.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Purely as a matter of definition, it would be helpful in considering these things and obviate a lot of lost time and energy in bringing those subjects out.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is called to my attention that Public Law 155 of the 82d Congress is the authority for this. I do not have that law before me at the moment, but that law authorizes a continuing process, I assume.

Admiral PERRY. It does; yes, sir. And that law does not limit the use of these funds; the authorization itself does not limit these funds to strictly advance planning funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What does the act say, in effect? Do you have it before you?

Admiral PERRY. I do not have it before me at the moment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While you are looking that up, I am very much sold on the procedure of having adequate advance plans and having detailed plans at the time you go to contract.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because that places you, as a contracting official, in a precarious position if you do not have that advance planning.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I realize under the impact of the wartime situation so many things had to be done "yesterday" as it were, that much of the refined details could not be accomplished. I appreciate that. But under existing circumstances the time element, I think, permits pretty much of a detailed operation, comparatively speaking; does it not?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir, it does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that leaves you in a much better and more advantageous position than to have to operate under the pressure you had to heretofore; is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And in fact, in the long run, it is a money-saving device for the benefit of the taxpayers as well; is not that true?

Admiral PERRY. I feel it is and I feel that we come before you much better prepared to give you detailed information.

You know, I have lived with this particular proposition for many years and while we have had in the past guidelines for the cost of buildings, they were purely guidelines and we might be off 50 percent, sometimes, one way or the other when we used them, and we would give a distorted picture to you in our estimates, when we came up before this committee, as to the cost of an individual project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have Public Law 155 before you now?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir. Section 504 reads:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with public-works projects which are not otherwise authorized by law in such amounts as may be provided in the appropriation act concerned. Such sums as are appropriated shall remain available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Questions on this item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This request, as I understand it, is entirely with respect to fiscal year 1957 projects. Is that correct?

Admiral PERRY. It could be also for 1958 and possibly even for 1959.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For projects after 1956?

Admiral PERRY. For projects after 1956; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. On what assumed program was this based?

Admiral PERRY. Well, we can take this fact: That if we have a $200 million program——

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am asking on what assumption the request is made, what assumed program.

Admiral PERRY. I was going to explain that to you, Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, it is a very simple question. You can give me the dollars and cents, I think, without elaborating in detail.

Admiral PERRY. We would have $3 million in this fund strictly for advance planning.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Ou the basis of what size of program?

Admiral PERRY. On the basis of a $400 million program, Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. $400 million?

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. 1 percent of that is $4 million, and three-quarters of 1 percent is $3 million.

Admiral PERRY. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How do you arrive at the figure of $15 million, which I assume is for detailed planning, on the assumption you have just given me?

Admiral PERRY. On the basis of a $400 million program we would require for detailed plans and specifications a minimum of $20 million.

We have asked in this particular request for $12 million to apply against a possible $20 million needed. In other words, we would be able to prepare detailed plans and specifications on 60 percent of the projects of the $400 million worth of projects.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS (NAVY AND MARINE CORPS)

REHABILITATION OF EXISTING HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, "Various locations, Navy and Marine Corps, rehabilitation of existing housing," under Public Law 765, 83d Congress. You are asking for $1,218,300. This is reflected on page CFH 11–1 of your justifications. Proceed with your presentation, please.

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, under existing law it is mandatory that all military personnel forfeit their quarters allowance in full when occupying public quarters irrespective of any inadequacy or degree of inadequacy.

While this condition exists within the continental United States, in overseas areas this inequity is especially prevalent and harmful to morale because of the limited appropriations in the past to improve these existing substandard quarters. This project is required to provide funds to rehabilitate 487 substandard quarters to make them more livable—although they will still be deficient in floor area—and to bring them more in line with the standard quarters, thereby raising the morale of the occupants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be the result if you do not get this rehabilitation money for these properties?

Admiral PERRY. We do not have sufficient funds, Mr. Chairman, to properly maintain the houses which we have as quarters. Therefore, we cannot use those funds to do anything with these 487 except to keep them in status quo.

If the money is not given to try to rehabilitate them, they will still be occupied, and the individual tenant will still be checked for his quarters allowance.

However, I personally think it is unfair for the Government to give a man a certain rental allowance and then to give him, let us say, a pigpen to live in and take away his rental allowance. That is what the circumstances are with respect to these 487 quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What association would this request have with previous maintenance money, if any?

Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I think that this request is a supplemental request to maintenance funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your answer in my opinion is 100 percent correct. In other words, over the period of time, if there had been adequate amount of maintenance money available, many of these rehabilitation units which are presently considered as part of the $1,218,000-plus request would not have been in here. Is that right?

Admiral PERRY. I agree with the chairman 100 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. ANDREWS. What types of houses are these, Admiral?

Admiral PERRY. All types, Mr. Andrews. Some might be homoja huts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Corrugated iron?

Admiral PERRY. Corrugated iron; yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice your unit cost is $2,500 for repairs.

Admiral PERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can you do a good job with that amount of money?

Admiral PERRY. The selected units of which I speak are presently in a bad state of repair. We cannot increase the area, but certainly we can brighten up the exteriors, repair the plumbing, and in general make them more livable than they are at the present time.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And put in some new bases in your showers, for example?

Admiral PERRY. We would need those; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I observe you do in many instances.

Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES—OVERSEAS

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT, CANAL ZONE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your next item is in volume 3 of your justifications, the latter part of the book, under title of "Yards and docks facilities—overseas," and the first item reflected is the 15th Naval District, Canal Zone, wherein the total request is for $3,069,000, comprising conversion of electrical power system in the amount of $2,529,000, and your family housing for 40 enlisted men, $540,000.

I note at this installation the plant value is not applicable; funded construction not in plant value is not applicable; the proposed 1956 authorization, $2,529,000; the proposed 1956 appropriation, $2,529,000; and the estimated future appropriation required, $3,321,000.

Present your justification for the item.

Admiral CLARK. The first item is to provide the first increment of conversion of the Navy electric installations and equipment from 25-cycle to 60-cycle simultaneously with its supplier, which is the Panama Canal Company. Replacement or conversion of all Navy 25-cycle frequency sensitive equipment to 60-cycle except certain inactive

equipment will be required as scheduled below, and I will list it, because only 60-cycle current will be available after the dates listed.

In the first increment we are supposed to finish by April 1, 1956. The second increment we will finish in January of 1958 to April 1, 1958. The Panama Canal Company actually is undertaking this now, sir. The Air Force has converted. The Army is converting with the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is a combination of enlargement because of load requirement?

Admiral CLARK. It is not only load requirements. All of the modern equipment produced now in the United States is 60-cycle equipment, so we cannot take anything produced in the United States down to the Canal Zone without an extensive conversion job before it goes there, such things as X-ray machines, auxiliary generator stations, all of the fans, iceboxes, everything else.

As I said we will not convert some of our cranes which are not needed immediately but which we would need on mobilization. We have figured out a time schedule so in case of mobilization we can go ahead with that part of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With reference to the family housing requirement, wherein you ask $540,000, explain that.

Admiral CLARK. This is to reimburse the Panama Canal Company for twelve 2-family and four 4-family dwellings, a total of 40 quarters, occupied since 1942 by Navy personnel under license from the Panama Canal Company and on land being acquired from the Company.

If the Panama Canal Company and the Army have confirmed the essentiality of the Navy remaining on this property and the Canal Company has demanded return of the quarters or payment if not purchased, 40 families will be dispossessed. No other quarters are available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Aside from payment to the Panama Canal you want $75,000 to rehabilitate the quarters and bring them up to the minimum required by Navy standards?

Admiral CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature of this?

Admiral PERRY. Conversion of the electrical power systems advance planning was performed by Gibbs & Hill, Inc., of New York City. They made the engineering study and actually are proceeding with the overall A. and E. plans, and we have paid them $195,000 for the entire job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.

PUBLIC WORKS CENTER—GUAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item we will pick up is the Public Works Center at Guam, wherein you request a total appropriation of $940,000 to replace two bridges in the Marianas.

I note at this installation the plant value is $43,426,957; funded construction not in plant value is not applicable; existing unfunded authorization is not applicable; proposed 1956 authorization is $940,000; proposed 1956 appropriation is $940,000; the estimated future appropriation required is $28,322,000.

Proceed with the justifications, gentlemen.

Admiral CLARK. There are two bridges, sir, a Fonte River Bridge, and Masso River Bridge, both wooden bridges constructed during the war, and they have deteriorated to a point where they are unsafe to carry loads which must pass over them so that bridges now must be replaced with permanent structures to permit uninterrupted movement of military and construction equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will these be of wood again?

Admiral PERRY. No, sir; the Fonte River Bridge will consist of two 40-foot-span reinforced concrete girder bridges supported on concrete abutments and piers.

The Masso River Bridge will be reinforced concrete with 35-foot span on concrete abutments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about the engineering?

Admiral PERRY. The engineering for this was done by the area public works office, Guam-Marianas Islands.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is the basis of these estimated costs?

Admiral PERRY. Estimates were prepared, as I say, by the area public works office, Guam-Marianas Islands.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Who will do the work?

Admiral PERRY. Private contractors will do the work.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. After competitive bidding?

Admiral PERRY. After competitive bidding; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?

Mr. OSTERTAG. These bridges are on Government property, are they not?

Admiral PERRY. United States Government property and this will be done by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior.

The responsibility for roads on Guam was divided as follows:

Wholly maintained by Navy 37 miles; maintained by Navy-Government of Guam, where 20 percent of the cost is contributed by Guam, 69.2 miles; maintained by Navy cross service agreement with the Air Force, 19.8 miles; maintained by the Government of Guam solely, 48.2 miles. That is the agreement.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I not in your justification that it calls for Filipino stevedores to replace contract employees.

What is the significance of that? Has that anything to do with this work?

Admiral PERRY. That has nothing to do with this work at all. They were explaining the personnel figures on the island of Guam.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Which has to do with personnel?

Admiral PERRY. Yes. Those people come under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. I have nothing whatever to do with them.
Mr. OSTERTAG. That is all.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS, REPLACEMENT OF OVERSEAS HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item, gentlemen, is "Various locations, replacement of overseas housing." You are asking for $2,200,000. This is reflected on page OS 11–3 of the justifications.
I note that the existing unfunded authorization is $3,200,000, proposed 1956 authorization is zero, the proposed 1956 appropriation is $2,200,000 and the estimated future appropriations required is $1 million. Please make your presentation.
Admiral CLARK. The replacement of 380 substandard housing units on Guam and the replacement of 60 substandard housing units in the Philippines is required as part of a continuing program authorized in Public Law 534 of the 82d Congress.
Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the engineering feature connected with this, Admiral?
Admiral PERRY. Mr. Chairman, all of these replacement housing units—and we have had quite a program in this respect during the past 3 or 4 years—were designed in the Office of the Director of the Pacific Division of the Bureau of Yards and Docks
You will note that the unit cost for each one of these houses is only $5,000. That $5,000 represents cost of materials only, since the houses themselves are built by construction battalion forces.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?
(No response.)
Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen.

ADJUSTED BUDGET ESTIMATE

Admiral Smith, you have a statement you wish to make and you also have an important luncheon engagement. You make your statement and we will excuse you if we have to proceed further.
(Discussion held off the record.)
Admiral SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT CONCERNING HOUSE DOCUMENT 210

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations hearings on Public Works, Navy, were commenced prior to the transmission of the proposed supplemental appropriation to the Congress.
At that time the Secretary of Defense had forwarded the approved estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. Accordingly, the testimony given to the Appropriations Committee by Department of Defense officials has been based on their approved estimates, which allocated $530,345,000 new obligational authority to Public Works, Navy.
Subsequently, on July 1, 1955, the President transmitted his proposed supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense, which included $528,550,000 new obligation for the "Public Works, Navy." This is a reduction of $1,795,000 from the earlier request made before this committee by the Navy.

It is requested that the committee consider requests made by Navy Department representatives to be hereby altered to be consistent with the Presidential proposal; namely, $528,550,000 in new obligational authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Admiral Smith.

We have before us a supplemental bill which we recently received, House Document 210, dated July 1, 1955.

I call your attention to the public works paragraph, "Military construction, Navy," wherein there is additional language incorporated.

What is the effect of that language as you interpret it and as presented in this supplement?

Is there any significance connected with it?

Admiral SMITH. I have a statement concerning the language changes which I wish to submit for the record at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF LANGUAGE CHANGES

I. An additional amount for acquisition: This is included to be consistent with the language for "Military construction, Army" and "Military construction, Air Force."

II. The act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209): This public law is the Public Works Authorization Act of 1954 and should be included in the language in order to permit the use of 1956 appropriations to fund projects authorized in the 1954 program.

III. The act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765): This public law is the Family Housing Authorization Act of 1955 and its inclusion is necessary in order to permit the use of funds appropriated in the 1956 family housing authorized in 1955.

IV. And the act of ———, 1955 (Public Law ——): This language refers to the fiscal year 1956 military construction and public works authorization bill not yet passed by Congress and its inclusion is necessary in order to fund the projects included in that act.

V. Without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statues, as amended: Section 1136 requires that detailed plans, specifications, and estimates of barracks, quarters, and other structures be submitted to Congress and that the title for the land be certified by the Attorney General of the United States prior to expending public money. Section 3734 limits the cost on payment for sites to the specific amount stated in the appropriation and further provides that plans for public building be approved by GSA. Exemption from the provisions of these two sections are necessary in order that the public works program may be executed expeditiously. The Civil Engineering Corps of the United States Navy has the capability of protecting the Government's interest in the event that the Navy Department is exempted from the provisions of the aforementioned sections. These exemptions are also contained in past public works authorizations.

VI. Hire of passenger motor vehicles: In the fiscal year 1955 the Department of Defense established a new policy concerning the utilization of passenger motor vehicles. The new policy is designed to reduce the inventory of passenger motor vehicle equipment within the Department of Defense. This reduction is being accomplished by accentuating the use of passenger vehicle pools, hire of passenger vehicles when it is considered to be more economical, and various other means of compensating Government personnel for travel performed while on official duty. This means that certain officers in charge of construction and certain district public works officers who have previously used Government vehicles in executing the public works program may not now have the vehicles available.

Where the use of vehicles is related to the construction of public works projects the prudent use of construction money would require the hire of passenger vehicles during the construction period. The new language permits them to hire these vehicles.

This is consistent with the express authority heretofore granted to the Air Force and Army in previous years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any other questions, gentlemen?
Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Wigglesworth?
Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Ostertag?
Mr. OSTERTAG. No questions.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, gentlemen.
The hearings on military public works are hereby concluded.

APPENDIX

(The following analysis of 1955 program was supplied in response to request on p. 97:)

64997—55——24

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
SHIPYARD FACILITIES							
NSY, Boston, Mass.: Replacement of pier 11.	$3,400,000	$3,400,000	0	$3,400,000	$97,200	$92,200	$3,302,800
NSY, Charleston, S. C.: Compressed air facilities.	555,000	555,000	0	555,000	255,213	0	299,787
NSY, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif.: Acquisition of railroad facilities, including land.	225,000	225,000	0	225,000	3,300	2,300	221,700
NMCS, Panama City, Fla.: Waterfront and technical facilities.	1,254,000	0	$1,254,000	1,254,000	40,996	30,836	1,213,004
NSY, San Francisco, Calif.: Crane tracks for drydock, and pipefitters shop.	2,091,000	0	2,091,000	2,091,000	122,093	71,128	1,968,907
FLEET FACILITIES							
Moorehead City, N. C.: LST loading ramps, including land acquisition.	710,000	0	710,000	710,000	476,413	24,300	233,587
NSB, New London, Conn.: Ordnance facility.	476,000	0	476,000	476,000	27,047	14,000	448,953
NMB, Charleston, S. C.: Land acquisition.	158,000	158,000	0	158,000	0	0	158,000
AVIATION FACILITIES							
NAS, Alameda, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance and overhaul facilities.	4,463,000	0	4,463,000	4,463,000	2,440,388	94,752	2,022,612
Alice-Orange Grove area, Tex.: Operational facilities.	151,000	0	151,000	151,000	0	0	151,000
NAS, Atlantic City, N. J.: Operational facilities and navigational aids.	779,000	0	246,000	246,000	0	0	246,000

projects, 1955 fiscal year program

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
Sept. 17, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications for pier construction (A. and E.).	Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Boston, Mass.	$97,200	95
June 17, 1955	Construction of pier 11	Merritt, Charman & Scott, New York, N. Y.	3,076,588	0
Jan. 31, 1955	Procure 10,000 c. f. m. compressor	Ingersoll-Rand Co., Birmingham, Ala.	171,154	30
....do	Procure 5,000 c. f. m. compressor	Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., New York, N. Y.	84,059	30
Dec. —, 1954	Appraisal	Franklin McLoren, San Francisco, Calif.	2,300	100
Oct. 4, 1954	Schematics of laboratory facilities.	Rader Engineering Co., Miami, Fla.	4,952	100
Oct. 26, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications (A. and E.).	....do	36,042	95
June 24, 1955	Construction, waterfront facilities.	Harder's Construction Co., Panama City, Fla.	429,778	0
June 30, 1955	Construction, technical facilities.	Kenneth Fulghum Construction Co., Pensacola, Fla.	591,280	0
Sept. 14, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications, pipefitters shop.	Myron C. Gould Associates, San Francisco, Calif.	45,540	95
Sept. 16, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications for crane tracks.	Indenco Engineers, Oakland, Calif.	45,780	95
May 6, 1955	Relocate building No. 274	Engstrum & Nourse Co., San Francisco, Calif.	30,773	90
June 14, 1955	Construct pipefitters shop	J. Bettancourt & Co., San Bruno, Calif.	781,184	0
June 16, 1955	Construct crane tracks	M. & K. Corp., San Francisco, Calif.	691,000	0
Sept. 14, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications (A. and E.).	L. E. Wooten & Co., Raleigh, N. C.	26,000	95
May 27, 1955	Construct loading ramp	McLean Contracting Co., Baltimore, Md.	396,500	5
....do	Dredging	Norfolk Dredging Co., Norfolk, Va.	48,263	0
Sept. 14, 1954	Detailed plans and specifications (A. and E.).	Pederson & Tilney, New Haven, Conn.	27,047	95
	None			
Sept. 21, 1954	A. and E. for air turbine and compressor building.	Kaiser Engineers, Oakland, Calif.	30,600	100
Sept. 22, 1954	A. and E. for electric and electronics overhaul building.	....do	101,000	100
Mar. 22, 1955	Extension of engine accessories shop building No. 66.	Fred J. Early Jr., Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	210,795	30
May 5, 1955	Substation for building No. 66 and air turbine building.	Ets-Hokin & Galvan, Oakland, Calif.	69,993	0
May 31, 1955	Electric and electronics overhaul building.	Swinerton & Walberg, Oakland, Calif.	2,028,000	0
June 14, 1955	Air turbine and compresson building.	....do	627,000	0
Jan. 17, 1955	A. and E. for control tower	Mitchell & Hunt, San Antonio, Tex.	5,000	100
	Project not yet advertised for bids. Planned bid date in August 1955.			

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
AVIATION FACILITIES—CON.							
MCAAS, Beaufort, S. C.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, administrative and community facilities, open and covered storage and fuel storage facilities, utilities, security facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and land acquisition.	$110,96,000	----------	$10,497,025	$10,497,025	$324,125	$246,396	$10,172,900
NAS, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, navigational aids and utilities.	632,000	----------	34,000	34,000	----------	----------	34,000
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.: Operational facilities, covered storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, navigational aids and utilities.	1,384,000	0	450,000	450,000	29,719	2,363	420,281
NCAS, Cherry Point, N. C.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communication facilities, navigational aids, utilities and land acquisition.	1,609,000	$1,609,000	0	1,609,000	52,158	8,211	1,556,842
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Fuel dispensing facilities and navigational aids.	342,000	----------	269,000	269,000	----------	----------	269,000
NAAS, Corry Field, Fla.: Airfield pavements and airfield lighting facilities.	2,153,000	----------	2,153,000	2,153,000	47,769	32,244	2,105,231
MCAS, El Toro, Calif.: Fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids, communication facilities, and utilities.	1,675,000	1,275,000	0	1,275,000	541,384	71,704	733,616

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award	Contract title	Contractor and address	Contract price	Percent complete
(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Oct. 4, 1954	A. and E. for parking area, hangars and ammunition storage.	Lockwood & Green, Spartanburg, S. C.	$62,500	100
....do	Engineering services (station survey) and A. and E. for utilities systems.	M. H. Connell, Miami, Fla.	166,245	100
Oct. 5, 1954	A. and E. for personnel, supply and administrative facilities.	Turnbull & Baker, Charleston, S. C.	54,095	100
June 24, 1955	Construct parking apron	Rea Construction Co., Charlotte, N. C.	794,800	0
June 28, 1955	Class C maintenance hangar, squadron hangars and ammunition storage.	Henry C. Beck, Atlanta, Ga.	1,730,000	0
June 30, 1955	Personnel facilities	J. A. Jones, Charlotte, N. C.	2,856,700	0
....do	Supply, administrative and recreation facilities.	....do	489,800	0
....do	Heating plant, distribution system, and fire pumphouse.	Singleton & Sullivan, Arlington, Va.	1,047,000	0
....do	Utilities, roads, railroad, etc.	Boyle Construction Co., Sumter, S. C.	1,044,870	0
	Project not yet advertised for bids. Planned bid date in August 1955.			
Oct. 26, 1954	A. and E. for supply facilities.	Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla.	10,500	100
	Award of construction contracts for a supply building, utilities, and an oxygen service and test building are scheduled for award in the first quarter, fiscal year 1956. The visual omnidirectional range facility will be designed and constructed under the supervision of the CAA.			
Sept. 24, 1954	A. and E. for fuel-dispensing facilities and addition to water plant.	L. E. Wooten, Raleigh, N. C.	22,940	100
Nov. 24, 1954	A. and E. for taxiway replacement	H. M. Olsen, Wilmington, N. C.	10,000	50
....do	A. and E. for communications facilities.	B. O. Vannort, Charlotte, N. C.	2,318	100
Mar. 24, 1955	A. and E. for navigational aids	....do	16,000	70
Mar. 7, 1955	Land acquisition		900	
	Advertisement and award of construction contracts is planned in September 1955.			
	Bids were received in excess of funds available, and were rejected. New bids, based on revised specifications, are scheduled for July 1955.			
Oct. 26, 1954	Preparation plans and specifications for improvements to landing field.	J. B. Converse & Co., Inc., Mobile, Ala.	47,469	68
June 27, 1955	Construction of improvements to landing field.	Rea Construction Co., Charlotte, N. C.	1,483,500	0
Sept. 9, 1954	A. and E. services for fuel-dispensing system.	M. A. Nishkian, Long Beach, Calif.	29,835	100
Dec. 16, 1954	A. and E. services for communications facilities.	W. F. Mellin, San Bernardino, Calif.	4,972	100
Dec. 21, 1954	Fencing	Guardian Fence Co., Long Beach, Calif.	7,185	100
Apr. 25, 1955	Fuel-dispensing system	R. E. Ziebarth and S. B. Alper & Co., Torrence, Calif.	457,000	0
May 28, 1955	Utilities	Drury Electric Co., San Bernardino, Calif.	41,596	88
June 14, 1955	Communication facilities	Allison Honer Co., Santa Ana, Calif.	149,750	0

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
AVIATION FACILITIES—con.							
NAAS, Fallon, Nev.: Operational facilities, personnel facilities, and medical facilities.	$569,000	0	$468,000	$468,000	$358,500	$17,757	$109,500
NAS, Glenview, Ill.: Land acquisition.	70,000	0	70,000	0,000	2,200	2,200	67,800
NAAS, Glynco, Ga.: Fuel storage facilities, communication facilities, utilities, training equipment, and land acquisition.	6,531,000	$5,022,498	1,162,502	6,185,000	1,349,533	668,333	4,835,467
NAAS, Kingsville, Tex.: Navigational aids, fuel storage facilities, and utilities.	666,000	----------	328,000	328,000	292,793	----------	35,207
NAF, Litchfield Park, Ariz.: Operation facilities, airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, communication facilities, and land acquisition.	1,654,000	----------	1,426,220	1,426,220	42,389	32,387	1,383,831
NAAF, Mayport, Fla.: Land acquisition.	75,000	----------	75,000	75,000	----------	----------	75,000
NAS, Miramar, Calif.: Navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities.	4,001,000	----------	3,258,000	3,258,000	121,202	10,377	3,136,798
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.: Navigational aids, fuel dispensing facilities, training facilities, and land acquisition.	1,336,000	27,000	1,149,000	1,176,000	475,990	16,665	700,010
MCAAS, Mojave, Calif.: Land acquisition.	160,000	----------	160,000	160,000	----------	----------	160,000
MCAF, New River, N. C.: Personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities.	972,000	----------	972,000	972,000	44,357	9,568	927,643
NAS, Norfolk, Va.: Training facilities.	628,000	----------	628,000	628,000	34,100	17,550	593,900

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
Nov. 3, 1954	A. and E. services for additional aviation facilities.	Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	$20,500	100
May 23, 1955	Additional aviation facilities	C. H. Leavell & Co., El Paso and El Paso, Tex. and Utah Construction Co., San Francisco, Calif.	338,000	0
	Departmental and congressional approval of acquisition of individual ownerships now in process.			
Oct. 25, 1954	Plans and specifications for communications facility, utilities, and roads.	Patchen & Zimmerman, Augusta, Ga.	30,123	100
June 30, 1955	Construction utilities and roads	H. W. Peerson, Birmingham, Ala.	557,875	
	Procurement and installation of equipment by BuShips and industry manager, 6ND.		5,000,000	13
Apr. 15, 1955	Construction, electrical distribution system.	Electric Construction Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.	292,793	5
Sept. 13, 1954	A. and E. for airfield pavements	Johannessen & Girard, Phoenix, Ariz.	25,420	100
do	A. and E. for aircraft maintenance and communication facilities.	Lescher & Mahoney, Phoenix, Ariz.	10,164	100
Nov. 30, 1954	A. and E. for control tower	do	6,300	85
	Advertisement and award of construction contracts scheduled for first quarter, fiscal year 1956. Submitted for approval of congressional committees.			
Sept. 29, 1954	A. and E. for RATTC	Adrian Wilson, Los Angeles, Calif.	16,500	100
Feb. 8, 1955	A. and E. for hangar and utilities, etc.	Kistner, Wright & Wright, Los Angeles, Calif.	103,002	100
June 27, 1955	Hangar and utilities, etc	M. H. Golden Construction Co., San Diego, Calif.	2,338,000	
June 28, 1955	RATTC	Teyssier & Teyssier, Chula Vista, Calif.	239,920	
Sept. 16, 1954	A. and E. for high-speed apron fueling system.	Earl & Wright, San Francisco, Calif.	18,000	92
June 4, 1955	High-speed apron fueling system	Fred J. Early, Jr. Co., San Francisco, Calif.	449,425	0
	Departmental and congressional approvals in process.			
Nov. 24, 1954	A. and E. for fiscal year 1955 program.	J. N. Pease & Son, Charlotte, N. C.	18,050	100
May 24, 1955	Utilities	A. J. Jenkins & Son, Warsaw, N. C.	26,307	0
June 2, 1955	BOQ and mess	T. A. Loving Co., Goldsboro, N. C.	168,280	5
June 16, 1955	Tactical vehicle maintenance facilities.	King, Hunter, Greensboro, N. C.	88,953	0
June 28, 1955	Barracks	T. A. Loving Co., Goldsboro, N. C.	381,885	0
Oct. 20, 1954	A. and E. for EMT building and ASW shops.	Lublin, McGaughy & Associates, Norfolk, Va.	24,100	100
Jan. 19, 1955	Soil borings	Froehling & Robertson, Inc., Richmond, Va.	10,000	100
June 30, 1955	EMT building and ASW shops	Thorington Construction Co., Inc., Norfolk, Va.	515,000	

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
AVIATION FACILITIES—con.							
NAS, Oceana, Va.: Personnel facilities, community facilities, covered storage facilities, security facilities, navigational aids, utilities and aircraft maintenance facilities.	$4,696,000	$4,106,000	----------	$4,106,000	$264,837	$101,287	$3,841,163
NAS, Pensacola, Fla.: Navigational aids and construction of outlying field, including avigation easements, and land acquisition.	1,533,000	0	$286,679	286,679	82,379	0	204,300
NAMTC, Point Mugu, Calif. (San Nicolas Island): Testing facilities, administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, security facilities and utilities.	1,132,000	----------	1,030,000	1,030,000	46,051	40,089	983,949
NAS, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities and aircraft maintenance facilities.	1,157,000	----------	816,450	816,450	45,430	36,635	771,020
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex. (Padre Island): Operational facilities.	80,000	80,000	----------	80,000	75,315	57,645	4,685
NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, communications facilities, navigational aids, and utilities.	4,197,000	----------	3,797,000	3,797,000	386,420	14,135	3,410,580

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
Sept. 24, 1954	A. and E. for aviation service facility.	Groll, Beach & Associates, Washington, D. C.	$4,000	0
Sept. 24, 1954	A. and E. for utilities, roads, and walks.	Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Norfolk, Va.	8,400	100
Oct. 20, 1954	A. and E. for auditorium and Navy exchange, fire station, security facilities and barracks.	Clark, Buhr & Nexsen, Norfolk, Va.	64,583	100
Jan. 4, 1955	Soil borings	Froehling & Robertson, Inc., Richmond, Va.	18,000	100
Jan. 5, 1955	A. and E. for maintenance hangar.	Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Norfolk, Va.	75,000	100
Apr. 15, 1955	Underground duct for RATTC	Counties Contracting & Construction Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	87,000	90
June 8, 1955	Security facilities	Carter-Hassel Construction Co., Inc., Norfolk, Va.	37,421	5
June 23, 1955	Auditorium and Navy exchange	J. L. Coe Construction Co., Inc., Charlotte, N. C.	625,364	0
do	Fire station	Bay Construction Co., Inc., Norfolk, Va.	87,880	5
June 24, 1955	Visual omnidirectional range	J. R. Houska Co., Inc., Norfolk, Va.	22,783	0
June 27, 1955	Utilities, roads and walks	J. L. Coe Construction Co., Inc., Charlotte, N. C.	266,440	0
do	Radar air traffic control center	Van DeRiet Construction Co., Norfolk, Va.	72,300	0
June 30, 1955	Hangar	George Blythe-Conner Co., Norfolk, Va.	1,988,200	0
Oct. 26, 1954	A. and E. for construction of OLF Western No. 1. Advertisement and award of construction contract delayed pending clearance of land item. Design and construction of visual omnidirectional range facilities is being accomplished by the CAA.	J. B. Converse & Co., Mobile, Ala.	82,379	100
Sept. 17, 1954	Plans and specifications for San Nicolas Island facilities. Bids received in June were in excess of funds available; various alternates are under consideration now.	Holmes & Narver, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	46,051	----
Oct. 29, 1954	A. and E. for extension to building No. 379 for fuel accessories overhaul.	Kistner, Wright & Wright, Los Angeles, Calif.	29,580	100
Sept. 13, 1954	A. and E. for seaplane beaching facility.	Wilson & Wilson, Los Angeles, Calif.	15,850	100
June 30, 1955	Extension to building No. 379 for fuel accessories overhaul.	M. H. Golden Construction Co., San Diego, Calif.	684,500	0
Jan. 11, 1955	Gunnery targets and facilities	Burnett Construction Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.	75,315	100
Sept. 14, 1954	A. and E. for addition to heating plant.	G. E. Wieland, Seattle, Wash.	14,000	100
Oct. 1, 1954	A. and E. for communication and Nav-Aids facilities.	Beverly A. Travis and Associates, Seattle, Wash.	16,600	67
Oct. 26, 1954	A. and E. for design of hangar, airfield pavements and utilities.	John W. Maloney, Seattle, Wash.	107,820	100
May 17, 1955	Addition to heating plant	Fraser's Boiler Service, Inc., Seattle, Wash.	248,000	3
June 29, 1955	Class "C" aircraft maintenance hangar, airfield pavement and utilities.	James I. Barner Construction Co., Seattle, Wash.	2,830,800	0
do	Communications and Nav-Aids facilities.	Hall-Atwater, Inc., Seattle, Wash.	104,150	0

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
SUPPLY FACILITIES							
NSC, Cheatham Annex), Norfolk, Va.: Cold-storage facilities.	$653,000	$653,000	----------	$653,000	$441,908	$5,500	$211,092
NSC, Oakland, Calif.: Fire protection facilities.	3,051,000	----------	$3,051,000	3,051,000	2,432,872	24,750	618,128
MARINE CORPS FACILITIES							
MCDS, Albany, Ga.: Security facilities and maintenance facilities.	892,000	----------	360,000	360,000	24,169	17,402	335,831
MB, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and personnel facilities.	749,000	749,000	----------	749,000	350,867	29,430	398,133
MCRD, Parris Island, S. C.: Utilities, cold-storage facilities, and training facilities.	1,025,000	----------	1,025,000	1,025,000	123,159	25,500	901,841
MCS, Quantico, Va.: Personnel facilities and community facilities.	585,000	585,000	----------	585,000	205,527	23,272	379,473
MCRD, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities.	82,000	82,000	----------	82,000	70,997	6,532	11,003
ORDNANCE FACILITIES							
NAD, Charleston, S. C.: Barricaded sidings.	671,000	671,000	----------	671,000	419,000	50,043	252,000
NPG, Dahlgren, Va.: Testing facilities.	212,000	----------	212,000	212,000	15,360	13,824	196,640
NAD, Earle, N. J.: Land acquisition.	73,000	----------	73,000	73,000	----------	----------	73,000
NAD, Hawthorne, Nev.: Ordnance facilities.	308,000	308,000	----------	308,000	16,600	8,775	291,400
NOP, Indianapolis, Ind.: Research and development facilities.	1,183,000	1,183,000	----------	1,183,000	38,000	35,000	1,145,000
NPF, Indian Head, Md.: Utilities.	345,000	----------	345,000	345,000	312,780	----------	32,220

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award	Contract title	Contractor and address	Contract price	Percent complete
(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Sept. 15, 1954	A. and E. rehabilitation cold storage building No. 40, secs. B, C, and D.	Carneal & Johnston, Richmond, Va.	$7,100	100
May 17, 1955	Replacement of roof structure and repairs to cold-storage building No. 40.	Robert M. Dunville & Bros. Inc., Richmond, Va.	434,808	0
Sept. 16, 1954	A. and E. services for fire protection facilities.	Earle & Wright, San Francisco, Calif.	55,000	100
Apr. 21, 1955	Automatic sprinkler systems	Wm. H. Ladew, Dallas, Tex	1,394,647	5
May 13, 1955	Extension water supply and storage facilities.	M. W. Garing, Oakland, Calif.	415,150	0
May 31, 1955	Construction of firewalls	A. B. Lahti, Berkeley, Calif	568,075	0
Oct. 6, 1954	A. and E. for maintenance shop	J. J. Harte, Atlanta, Ga	17,401	100
June 30, 1955	Maintenance shop	A. C. Samford, Inc., Albany, Ga.	322,499	0
Mar. 23, 1955	Temporary BOQ's	R. N. Rouse & Co., Goldsboro, N. C.	231,625	10
Apr. 26, 1955	Convert warehouse to shop	do	114,313	3
June 30, 1955	Combat training facilities	King-Hunter, Inc., Greensboro, N. C.	46,300	0
Sept. 14, 1954	A. and E. for cold-storage building.	The McPherson Co., Greenville, S. C.	25,000	100
do	A. and E. for classrooms	Lyles, Bissett, etc., Columbia, S. C.	3,450	100
Mar. 24, 1955	Extend steam lines to 3d battalion area.	Sechinger Co., Savannah, Ga	94,709	5
June 30, 1955	Cold-storage building	Byck-Worrell Construction Co., Savannah, Ga.	487,343	0
do	Classrooms	Span Altman Construction Co., Savannah, Ga.	331,048	0
Oct. 1, 1954	A. and E. for NCO quarters and mess.	Leon Chatelain, Washington, D. C.	7,820	100
Oct. 1, 1955	A. and E. for chapel	Murphy & Locraft, Washington, D. C.	14,350	100
Apr. 28, 1955	NCO quarters and mess	Victor R. Beauchamp, Inc., Washington, D. C.	179,619	5
Oct. 7, 1954	A. and E. for 3 classroom buildings.	Eggers & Fodder, La Mesa, Calif.	3,700	100
Mar. 2, 1955	3 classroom buildings	Callahan Bros., San Diego, Calif.	67,297	10
Jan. 26, 1955	Barricaded sidings	Ruscon Construction Co., Charleston, W. Va.	419,000	38
Oct. 22, 1954	A. and E. bombproof and conditioning rooms.	Arthur E. Magher Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.	15,330	100
June 1, 1955	Bombproof and conditioning rooms.	Conlee Construction Co., Washington, D. C.	130,856	0
	All ownerships not yet fully established; title search in process. Negotiations underway with established owners.			
Sept. 9, 1954	A. and E. for extension to projectile overhaul building.	Ernest Frederick Winkler, 251 Post St., San Francisco, Calif.	16,600	90
	Advertisement and award of construction contract is scheduled for August 1955.			
Sept. 1, 1954	A. and E. fire control development and evaluation building.	Allied Engineers & Architects and Keeble Associates, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.	38,000	100
June 8, 1955	Fire control development and evaluation building.	Fruin-Colon Contracting Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	905,000	2
Oct. 15, 1954	A. and E. extension and improvement of river water distribution system.	Albright & Friel, Philadelphia, Pa.	14,080	100
May 18, 1955	Extension and improvements of river water distribution system.	John P. Evans, Inc., Washington, D. C.	298,700	0

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
ORDNANCE FACILITIES—con.							
NMD, Melville, R. I.: Ammunition storage facilities.	$351,899	$351,899	.....	$351,899	$205,127	$54,915	$146,772
NM, Port Chicago, Calif.: Transfer depot facilities and land acquisition.	519,000	519,000	.....	519,000	140,530	10,967	378,470
NOL, White Oak, Md.: Research and development facilities.	361,000	.....	$361,000	361,000	325,261	20,035	35,739
NMD, Yorktown, Va.: Barricaded sidings.	480,000	480,000	.....	480,000	428,100	11,813	51,900
SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES							
NA, Annapolis, Md.: Training facilities.	5,680,000	.....	4,082,000	4,082,000	2,890,400	96,013	1,191,600
NAB, Coronado, Calif.: Personnel facilities.	1,444,000	.....	1,444,000	1,444,000	1,264,800	.....	179,200
NPGS, Monterey, Calif.: Personnel facilities.	332,000	332,000	.....	332,000	275,782	.....	56,218
FADTC, Point Loma, Calif.: Training facilities.	340,000	340,000	.....	340,000	.....	.....	340,000
MEDICAL FACILITIES							
NH, St. Albans, Long Island, N. Y.: Utilities.	245,000	245,000	.....	245,000	8,500	6,120	236,500
NH, San Diego, Calif.: Personnel facilities.	756,000	.....	756,000	756,000	31,090	26,613	724,910
NH, Norfolk, Va.: Construction of permanent hospital.	12,582,000	79,627	8,051,000	8,130,627	.....	.....	8,130,627

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
May 18, 1899	A. and E. 4 magazines	Fenton G. Keyes Association, Providence, R. I.	$12,700	95
Jan. 7, 1955	4 magazines	C. Sullivan Co., Inc., Newport, R. I.	192,427	25
Sept. 22, 1954	A. and E. transfer depot	Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	7,350	95
Dec. 14, 1954	Appraisal	Edwin G. Wedland, San Francisco, Calif.	1,450	100
Dec. 13, 1954	do	Kenneth H. Smitten, San Francisco, Calif.	2,500	100
Dec. 15, 1954	Title evidence	Richmond-Martinez Title Co., Martinez, Calif.	1,500	100
May 10, 1955	Transfer depot Departmental and congressional approval of proposed land acquisition is in progress.	Engstrum & Nourse, San Francisco, Calif.	127,730	0
Oct. 15, 1954	A. and E. moored mine and antisubmarine weapons tank.	Roberts & Schaefer Co., New York, N. Y.	22,261	100
Apr. 18, 1955	Moored mine and antisubmarine weapons tank.	Humphries & Harding, Inc., Washington, D. C.	303,000	3
Sept. 16, 1954	A. and E. barricaded railroad sidings.	Philip D. Freeman, Norfolk, Va.	15,750	100
Apr. 26, 1955	Barricaded railroad sidings	George, Barnhill & Long, Inc., Tarboro, N. C.	412,350	5
June 1, 1954	A. and E. services for additional physical education facilities.	Harbison, Hough Livingston & Larson Von Storch, Evans, Scandale & Burkavage, Philadelphia, Pa.	128,000	95
Mar. 31, 1955	Gymnasium foundations	Wm. T. Lyons, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	153,400	25
May 28, 1955	Gymnasium (building)	Wm. E. Cramer Co., Washington, D. C.	2,384,000	2
May 31, 1955	Extension of utilities	Stehle, Beans & Bean, Baltimore, Md.	225,000	2
Oct. 28, 1954	A. and E. services, enlisted men's barracks for 860 men.	Austin, Field & Fry, Los Angeles, Calif.	37,800	100
May 31, 1955	Construction of enlisted men's barracks for 860 men.	M. H. Golden Construction Co., San Diego, Calif.	1,227,000	2
Mar. 31, 1955	Construction of enlisted men's barracks for 172 men.	F. V. Hampshire, Inc., Salinas, Calif.	256,445	15
	This project is principally for procurement and installation of long lead time technical equipment by the Office of Naval Research (Special Devices Center). Procurement action has been initiated.			
Sept. 14, 1954	A. and E. services for emergency standby generator.	Design Service Co., New York, N. Y.	8,500	100
June 30, 1955	Emergency standby generator	Plymouth Electric Construction Co., New York, N. Y.	96,800	0
Sept. 13, 1954	A. and E. services for 460-man permanent barracks. Construction. Bids received were in excess of funds as well as the statutory limitations on cost of barracks, and were rejected. Advertisement and the taking of new bids, based on reduced contract requirements, is scheduled for November 1955.	Van Dyke & Barnes, Los Angeles, Calif.	31,090	50
	A. and E. planning is being accomplished utilizing 1952 funds. Planned date of contract award for the hospital building, chargeable in part to the fiscal year 1955 program, is April 1956.			

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES							
NRL, Washington, D. C.: Research facilities.	$996,000	----------	$996,000	$996,000	$709,000	$18,630	$287,000
YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES							
NCBC, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Waterfront facilities and covered storage facilities.	3,384,000	----------	3,384,000	3,384,000	1,070,500	60,625	2,313,500
San Bruno, Calif.: Land acquisition.	750,000	$750,000	----------	750,000	3,564	2,250	746,436
MCTC, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Land acquisition.	14,000	----------	14,000	14,000	13,384	13,367	616
Various locations: For restoration or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed and provision for other urgent construction requirements.	2,528,101	1,731,599	794,636	2,526,235	1,881,692	730,975	644,543
Various locations, advance planning, public works projects.	3,750,000	3,750,000	----------	3,750,000	2,108,902	301,195	1,641,098
FLEET FACILITIES—OVERSEAS							
NS, Subic Bay, P. I.: Waterfront facilities.	9,976,000	$6,850,000	----------	6,850,000	6,140,700	----------	709,300
AVIATION FACILITIES—OVERSEAS							
NAF, Cubi Point, P. I.: Air-freight terminal facilities, personnel facilities, family housing, community facilities, waterfront protection facilities, covered and ammunition storage facilities, medical facilities, security facilities, and utilities.	6,085,000	5,462,000	----------	5,462,000	1,378,917	93,853	4,083,083
NAS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Medical facilities.	230,000	----------	$230,000	230,000	9,300	----------	220,700

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award	Contract title	Contractor and address	Contract price	Percent complete
(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Sept. 21, 1954	A. and E. for nuclear reactor	Mills, Petticord & Mills & Associates, Washington, D. C.	$23,000	100
May 31, 1955	Nuclear reactor	Blake Construction Co., Washington, D. C.	686,000	5
do	A. and E. for wharf	Moffat & Nichols, Long Beach, Calif.	28,800	0
do	A. and E. for warehouses	J. H. Pomeroy, Los Angeles, Calif.	36,100	0
do	Construction wharf	Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif.	1,001,000	0
June 23, 1955	Construction warehouses	L. D. Richardson, Beverly Hills, Calif.	1,159,419	0
	Congressional approval of proposed acquisition is in process.			
	Land acquired			
	Approximately 50 contracts for restoration of facilities damaged by Hurricanes Carol and Hazel have been awarded at various naval activities on the Atlantic seaboard. The remaining contracts are scheduled for award early in fiscal year 1956.			
	Approximately 200 small A. and E. contracts, administered by BuDocks field offices, have been awarded against this project. These contracts provide preliminary engineering information required for justification of public works projects before the Congress. The unobligated balance for this project has been committed by authorizations to the field to award additional contracts chargeable to these funds.			
Nov. 15, 1954	Alava dock, utilities construction.	Pomeroy-Hawaiian Dredging & Bechtel, San Francisco, Calif.	285,000	96
Dec. 23, 1954	Powerplant, 2d increment	do	2,605,000	15
do	Inner basin improvement	do	2,836,700	18
Mar. 18, 1955	Housing site preparation	do	275,000	0
do	Alava dock crane	Industrial Brown Hoist, Bay City, Mich.	139,000	15
Sept. —, 1954	A. and E. for fiscal year 1955 program.	Pomeroy-Hawaiian Dredging & Bechtel, San Francisco, Calif.	89,000	100
Mar. —, 1955	Air freight terminal building	do	51,000	5
do	Family quarters	do	143,500	5
do	Spare parts warehouse	do	128,000	5
do	Sick call room	do	41,350	5
May —, 1955	Supply storage	do	431,250	2
do	Navy exchange	do	257,000	2
	Construction work assigned to Naval Construction Battalion.		237,817	
Sept. —, 1954	A. and E. for dispensary	Maurice Connell & Steward & Skinner, Miami and New York.	9,300	100

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
AVIATION FACILITIES—OVERSEAS—continued							
NAS, Iwakuni, Japan: Airfield pavements, ammunition and fuel storage facilities, and aircraft maintenance facilities.	$2,246,000	$2,210,000	----------	$2,210,000	$476,970	$361,604	$1,733,030
NAS, Kodiak, Alaska: Community facilities.	719,000	----------	$719,000	719,000	254,299	----------	464,701
NS, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Aircraft maintenance facilities.	990,000	990,000	----------	990,000	764,258	21,180	225,742
SUPPLY FACILITIES—OVERSEAS							
NS, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Fuel facilities.	5,956,000	----------	5,956,000	5,956,000	5,658,200	19,604	297,800
COMMUNICATION FACILITIES—OVERSEAS							
NCS, Philippine Islands: Communication facilities, personnel facilities, covered storage facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, site preparation for family housing, land acquisition, waterfront facilities, and utilities.	8,791,000	6,520,000	----------	6,520,000	4,523,900	----------	1,996,100
YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES—OVERSEAS							
Various locations, overseas:							
For restoration or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed and provisions for other urgent construction requirements.	1,500,000	184,377	----------	184,377	149,128	41,940	35,249
Replacement of temporary housing.	4,000,000	800,000	----------	800,000	306,602	2,059	493,398
SECTION 202—CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS							
Various locations (continental): Aviation ordnance facilities.	2,666,000	----------	14,528	14,528	7,762	1,800	6,766

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
Nov. 1, 1954	Placing dredged fill	Hawaiian Dredging Co., Honolulu, Hawaii.	$229,500	$100
Dec. 15, 1954	Core borings and loading tests	K. Kitamura, Hiroshima, Japan.	1,399	100
Apr. 22, 1955	Construct canopies for hangars	Kajima Kensetsu Co., Hiroshima, Japan.	7,700	100
----------	Work completed by construction battalion maintenance unit No. 101.	----------	238,371	100
June 7, 1955	Improvements to hangars	Kajima Construction Co., Hiroshima, Japan.	73,000	----------
----do----------	Install POL facilities	Tokyo Denki Doboku K. K., Yokohama, Japan.	174,445	----------
June 16, 1955	Runway and taxiway extension	Takano Construction Co., Tokyo, Japan.	612,500	----------
Mar. —, 1955	Theater	Macri-Montgomery Co., Anchorage, Alaska.	240,300	5
----do----------	Site preparation for theater	By station forces, NAS, Kodiak	13,999	100
May 2, 1955	Aircraft maintenance shop	Fisher Construction Co., Honolulu, T. H.	764,258	5
Mar. 18, 1954	POL storage facilities	Pomeroy-Hawaiian Dredging & Bechtel, San Francisco, Calif.	5,658,200	2
Dec. —, 1954	Work in and around the Philippine Islands.	----do----------	4,523,900	0
----------	Funds were made available for repair of storm damage in the Oahu area. Restoration work is being performed by station forces (to date) and by a contract scheduled for award in the 1st quarter, fiscal year 1956.	----------	----------	----------
----------	Work being performed by naval construction battalion forces.	----------	----------	----------
Mar. 15, 1955	A. and E. for AUW shop, NAS, San Diego, Calif.	Frank L. Hope & Associates, San Diego, Calif.	7,762	90
June 1, 1955	A. and E. for AUW shop, Norfolk.	Clark, Buhr & Nexson, Norfolk, Va.	6,166	100

Location and project title	Current authorization as of June 30, 1955	Appropriation availability			Obligated as of May 31, 1955	Expended as of May 31, 1955	Unobligated balance as of May 31, 1955
		Appropriation, Public Law 663, 84th Cong.	Prior year appropriation	Total appropriation			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
SECTION 202—CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS—continued							
Various locations (overseas): Aviation ordnance facilities.	$6,225,000	----------	$4,117,000	$4,117,000	$584,766	----------	$3,532,234
A-17: Ammunition storage facilities.	2,345,000	$2,345,000	----------	2,345,000	1,721,957	$335,454	623,043
A-18: Fleet ammunition facilities.	4,639,000	2,319,000	----------	2,319,000	7,034	----------	2,311,966
A-20: Aviation facilities	21,281,000	15,000,000	$3,500,000	18,500,000	12,389,181	409,743	6,110,819
A-21: Fuel storage facilities	17,200,000	17,200,000	----------	17,200,000	17,200,000	17,200,000	----------
A-22: Fuel storage facilities	8,452,000	8,452,000	----------	8,452,000	8,452,000	8,452,000	----------
A-23: Ammunition storage facilities.	550,000	400,000	150,000	550,000	2,995	277	547,005
Total	210,803,000	98,000,000	78,056,040	176,056,040	[1] 83,915,141	[1] 30,248,022	92,140,899

[1] Obligations and expenditures are for construction costs, and do not include costs of contract administration and inspection which are undistributed at this date.

1955 fiscal year program—Continued

Date of award (9)	Contract title (10)	Contractor and address (11)	Contract price (12)	Percent complete (13)
Mar. 31, 1955	AUW shop, NAS, Kodiak	Macri-Montgomery Co., Anchorage, Alaska.	$320,546	9
May 27, 1955	AUW shop, NAS, Coco Solo. Site adaptation of standard plans and specifications for the remaining 16 overseas AUS shops is being performed by OICC design forces. Award of the remaining construction contracts is scheduled for the 1st half of fiscal year 1956.	Beldon, Inc., Curundu, C. Z.	264,220	5
Aug. 27, 1954	A. and E. additional ammunition storage facilities.	Clark, Buhr & Nexson, Norfolk, Va.	73,060	100
Feb. 9, 1955	Additional ammunition storage facilities.	Virginia Engineering Co., Inc., Newport News, Va.	1,648,897	40
Dec. 12, 1954	Supplemental construction drawings.	Pomeroy-Hawaiian Dredging & Bechtel, San Francisco, Calif.	7,034	100
June 25, 1955	Construction ammunition facilities.	do	1,503,144	0
Mar. 1, 1955	Replace existing facilities, purchase hangar doors and steel.	Ayers, Hagan, Booth, Providence, R. I.	1,082,229	75
Sept. 30, 1954	A. and E. and engineering studies, New York, N. Y.	Frank Grad & Sedge, Stevenson & Valen, New York, N. Y.	525,825	95
Apr. 29, 1955	Construction aviation facilities	Johnson-Drake-Piper, Merritt-Chapman-Scott, & Ayers, Hagan & Booth, New York, N. Y. and Providence, R. I.	10,756,900	10
	Rehabilitation, barracks by CB's.		25,227	2
Sept. 39, 1954	The obligations and expenditures reported result from the transfer of funds from the "Public Works, Navy" account to the "Navy management fund (Spanish bases)." Contracts actually issued to date for accomplishment of these 2 Navy POL projects are as follows:			
June 8, 1955	Construction of facilities, Spain.	Brown-Raymond-Walsh, 250 Hudson St., New York, N. Y., and Edificio, Espana, Madrid, Spain.	3,461,813	0
Jan. 4, 1955 Apr. 26, 1955	A. and E. services in Spain. The balance of the construction contracts for these projects are scheduled for award in the 1st half of fiscal year 1956.	AESB, Madrid, Spain	961,404	60
Nov. 1, 1954 June 27, 1955	Additional ammunition storage facilities, 2d increment.	Hawaiian Dredging Co., Honolulu, T. H.	477,300	62

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Allen, Brig. Gen. C. R	2
Bennett, Hon. C. F	140
Bruton, Rear Adm. H. C	2
Butler, Capt. J. B	2
Clark, Rear Adm. S. R	1
Cronin, Rear Adm. R. E	1
Dallerup, J. R	1
Davison, Capt. J. W	2
Dawson, Capt. W. L	2
Fenton, Maj. D. L	2
Fogler, Hon. R. H	1
Hanabury, M. R	2
Hines, Comdr K. W	1
Hogan, Rear Adm. B. W	2
Holloway, Vice Adm. J. L	2
Laird, Capt. G. H	2
Lefelar, Capt. Louis	1
Lucas, Capt. F. C., jr	327
MacGregor, Comdr S. H., jr	327
McFarland, Capt. C. B	1
McHenry, Capt. J. A	1
McKinney, Capt. E. B	1
Palmer, R. I	1
Parks, Rear Adm. J. D	2
Patterson, D. M	1
Pessaud, R. E	2
Richmond, Vice Adm. A. C	327
Rider, Capt. E. C	2
Robertson, Lt. Col. E. B	2
Ruff, Capt. L. E	2
Russell, Rear Adm. J. S	2
Scheiderer, Lt. Comdr. E. D	327
Smith, Rear Adm. H. P	1
Smyth, T. J	1
Springer, Capt. Frank	1
Stern, Comdr T. S	2
Stroop, Rear Adm. P. D	2
Tiencken, W. P	1
Trimble, Comdr P. E	327
Withington, Rear Adm. F. S	2

INDEX

A

	Page
Advance planning, various locations	258
AEW Nos. 2 and 3, location classified	221
Alameda, Calif.:	
Naval air station	134
Pollution abatement program	340
Alaska:	
Adak:	
Naval communications station	308
Naval station	87
Kodiak:	
Naval communication station	311
Naval station	212
Albany, Ga., Marine Corps Supply Center	232
Alice-Orange Grove Area, Tex., Naval Auxiliary Landing Field	97
Ammunition storage facilities, classified locations	275
Annapolis, Md.:	
John H. Towers Field, Naval air facility	181
Naval Academy	277
Naval station	280
Argentia, Newfoundland, Naval Station	205
Astoria, Oreg., Naval Station, Tongue Point	86
Athens, Ga., Navy Supply Corps School	280
Atlantic City, N. J., Naval Air Station	134
Authorization request and funding program, 1956, Summary of	8
Authorizations, appropriations and obligations	25
Authorizations requirements, estimated, and allowances under House bill, Variation between	26
Aviation facilities:	
Continental	94
Overseas	203
Additional, AEW Nos. 2 and 3, classified locations	221

B

Barin Field, Foley, Ala., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	98
Barstow, Calif., Marine Corps Supply Center	233
Beaufort, S. C.:	
Marine Corps auxiliary air station	165
Pollution abatement program	341
Bermuda, B. W. I. Naval Station	206
Bethesda, Md., Armed Forces Medical Library, National Naval Medical Center	294
Boston, Mass., Naval Shipyard	38
Bremerton, Wash., Naval Shipyard	41
Brown Field, San Diego County, Calif., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	135
Brunswick, Me., Naval Air Station	135
Budget estimates, adjusted	365

C

Camp Lejeune, N. C., Marine Corps Base	235
Camp Pendleton, Calif., Marine Corps Base	237
Canal Zone, Fifteenth Naval District	362
Carderock, Md., David W. Taylor Model Basin	43
Cecil Field, Fla., Naval Air Station	139

	Page
Charleston, S. C.:	
Naval ammunition depot	247
Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard	46
Naval minecraft base	48
Naval receiving station	281
Chase Field, Beeville, Tex., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	98
Chelsea, Mass. Naval Hospital	295
Cherry Point, N. C., Marine Corps Air Station	167
Chincoteague, Va.:	
Naval auxiliary air station	189
Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station	248
CINC NEIM, NAF No. 1, location classified	220
Classified projects	74
Communication facilities:	
Continental	306
Overseas	308
Contracting, Methods of	21
Corona, Calif., Naval Hospital	296
Coronado, Calif., Naval Amphibious Base	282
Corpus Christi, Tex.:	
Naval air station	101
Naval hospital	297
Correction of deficiencies, various locations	351
Crows Landing, Calif., Naval Auxiliary Landing Field	143
D	
Dahlgren, Va., Naval Proving Ground	249
Daingerfield, Tex., Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory	251
Dam Neck, Va., Fleet Air Defense Training Center	283
David W. Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md	43
Davisville, R. I., Naval Construction Battalion Center	333
E	
Earle, N. J., Naval Ammunition Depot	252
Eastern Mediterranean, Naval Communication Unit No. 1	322
Edenton, N. C., Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field	173
El Centro, Calif., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	143
El Toro, Calif., Marine Corps Air Station	170
F	
Fallbrook, Calif., Naval Ammunition Depot	253
Fallon, Nev., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	144
Family housing:	
Breakdown of	17
Existing housing, Rehabilitation of	361
Overseas, Replacement of	365
Fifteenth Naval District, Canal Zone	362
Fleet Aircraft Service Squadron 77, Naples, Italy	216
Fleet base facilities:	
Continental	76
Overseas	87
Funding program and appropriation request, Relationship between	19
Funds available, 1956 and amount of authorizations, Relationship between	28
G	
Glynco, Ga., Naval Air Station	102
Great Lakes, Ill.:	
Naval hospital	298
Naval training center	284
Green Cove Springs, Fla., Naval Station	78

	Page
Guam:	
Agana, Naval Air Station	203
Naval base	88
Naval hospital	303
Naval supply depot	227
Public Works Center	363
Guantanamo Bay, Cuba:	
Naval air station	209
Naval base	89
Naval supply depot	227
H	
Hawaii:	
Kaneohe Bay, Marine Corps Air Station	211
Oahu, Naval Ammunition Depot	273
Pearl Harbor:	
Fleet training center	291
Naval supply center	228
Hawthorne, Nev., Naval Ammunition Depot	254
Housing, existing, Rehabilitation of	361
H. R. 6829:	
Authorization requirements, estimated, and allowances under, Variation between	26
Construction authority under	8
Projects deleted from	33
Projects not requested by Navy for 1956	32
Hutchinson, Kans., Naval Air Station	107
I	
Indian Head, Md., Naval Powder Factory	256
Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal	285
Inyokern, Calif., Naval Ordnance Test Station	190, 257
J	
Jacksonville, Fla:	
Naval air station	145
Naval hospital	300
Navy fuel depot	224
Japan:	
Atsugi, Naval Air Station	206
Iwakuni, Naval Air Facility	210
Kami Seya, Naval Radio Facility	310
Sasebo:	
Fleet activities	74
Naval ordnance facility	274
Yokosuka, Fleet activities	93
John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Naval Air Facility	181
K	
Kearney, N. J., Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Pollution abatement program	347
Keyport, Wash., Naval Torpedo Station	257
Key West, Fla:	
Naval air station	146
Naval station, Family housing	78
Kingsville, Tex., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	108
Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, Naval Station	213
L	
Lakehurst, N. J., Naval Air Station	191
Land acquisition items	15
Land acquisitions and obstruction removal for flight clearance, Naval Air Stations, various locations	198
Loran stations	327
Louisville, Ky., Naval Ordnance Plant	258

M

	Page
Macon, Ga., Naval Ordnance Plant	259
Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif.:	
Naval shipyard	52
Pollution abatement program	347
Marine corps facilities	230
Mayport, Fla., Naval Auxiliary Landing Field	147
Medical facilities:	
Continental	292
Overseas	303
Memphis, Tenn., Naval Air Station	115
Miami, Fla., Marine Corps Air Station	174
Midway Island, Naval Station	214
Miramar, Calif., Naval Air Station	149
Moffett Field, Calif., Naval Air Station	151
Mojave, Calif., Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station	177
Monterey, Calif., Naval Postgraduate School	286

N

Naples, Italy, Fleet Aircraft Service Squadron 77	216
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., Armed Forces Medical Library	294
Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif	195
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md	194
Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Chincoteague, Va	248
Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Charleston, S. C	46
Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, Calif	264
Naval Medical Research Laboratory, Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn	300
Naval Minecraft Base, Charleston, S. C	48
Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex	251
Naval Photographic Interpretation Center, Suitland, Md	197
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, Calif	286
Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgreen, Va	249
Naval research facilities	324
Naval Research Laboratory:	
Bellevue, Washington, D. C	325
Chesapeake Bay Annex, Randall Cliff, Md	326
Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md	285
Navy Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, Calif	64
Navy Mine Countermeasures Station, Panama City, Fla	58
New Iberia, La., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	125
New London, Conn.:	
Naval Medical Research Laboratory, Naval Submarine Base	300
Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory	54
Newport, R. I.:	
Naval station	81
Naval supply depot	224
Naval Underwater Ordnance Station	264
New River, N. C., Marine Corps Air Facility	179
Norfolk, Va.:	
Naval air station	153
Naval base	82
Naval shipyard	53
Naval supply center	225
Public works center (Naval Base)	336
North Atlantic Area, Naval Radio Station	323
Northwest, Va., Naval Radio Station	307

O

Oakland, Calif., Naval Supply Center	226
Obligations	20, 25
Oceana, Va., Naval Air Station	155
Orange, Tex., Naval Station	83

	Page
Ordnance facilities:	
Continental	244
Overseas	273
Overseas housing, Replacement of	365
P	
Panama City, Fla., Navy Mine Countermeasures Station	58
Parris Island, S. C., Marine Corps Recruit Depot	236
Patuxent River, Md., Naval Air Test Center	194
Pensacola, Fla., Naval Air Station	116
Philadelphia, Pa.:	
Marine Corps Clothing Depot	240
Naval Hospital	303
Naval Receiving Station, Naval Base, Phildaelphia County	287
Naval shipyard	62
Philippine Islands:	
Cubi Point, Naval Air Facilities	207
Naval communication facility	316
Sangley Point, Naval Station	220
Subic Bay, Naval Base	89
Point Mugu, Calif., Naval Air Missile Test Center	195
Pollution abatement program, including land acquisition, various locations	339
Source of and authority for	348
Port Chicago, Calif., Naval Magazine	264
Port Hueneme, Calif., Naval Construction Battalion Center	338
Port Isabel, Tex., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	120
Port Lyautey, French Morocco:	
Naval air facility	218
Naval communication facility	319
Portsmouth, N. H.	
Naval retraining command	289
Naval shipyard	63
Program, 1955, Analysis of	367
Projects by location, Breakdown of	9
Public knowledge of estimates, Effect on contract bids	30
Q	
Quantico, Va., Marine Corps Schools	241
Quonset Point, R. I., Naval Air Station	158
R	
Randall Cliff, Md., Naval Research Laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex	325
Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, Naval Station	218
S	
St. Juliens Creek, Va., Naval Ammunition Depot	269
San Diego, Calif.:	
Brown Field, San Diego County, Naval Auxiliary Air Station	135
Fleet sonar school, San Diego County	290
Marine Corps Recruit Depot	243
Naval air station	159
Naval station	83
Navy Electronics Laboratory	64
Navy repair facility	65
Sanford, Fla., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	160
San Francisco, Calif.:	
Naval shipyard	66
Naval Station, Treasure Island	84
Pollution abatement program	348
Seal Beach, Calif., Naval Ammunition and Net Depot	270
Service school facilities	275

	Page
Shipyard facilities:	
Continental	35
Overseas	74
Shumaker, Naval Ammunition Depot	271
South Weymouth, Mass., Naval Air Station	196
Special Weapons Training Facility	159
Suitland, Md., Naval Photographic Interpretation Center	197
Supply Facilities	223
Continental	223
Overseas	227
T	
Tacoma, Wash., Naval Station	85
Twenty Nine Palms, Calif., Marine Corps Training Center	244
U	
Urgent requirements	24
W	
Washington, D. C.:	
Family housing, flag officers	76
Naval Research Laboratory	325
Weeksville, N. C., Naval Air Facility	161
Whidney Island, Wash., Naval Air Station	162
Whitehouse Field, Outlying Field, Fla	164
White Oak, Md., Naval Ordnance Laboratory	272
Whiting Field, Fla., Naval Auxiliary Air Station	133
Y	
Yards and Docks Facilities:	
Continental	332
Overseas	362
Yorktown, Va., Naval Mine Depot	272

○